

Benedetto Accolti D'arezzo, Florentine lawyer, humanist and chancellor.

Black, Robert Dale

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://qmro.qmul.ac.uk/jspui/handle/123456789/1394>

Information about this research object was correct at the time of download; we occasionally make corrections to records, please therefore check the published record when citing. For more information contact scholarlycommunications@qmul.ac.uk

241

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D.

BENEDETTO ACCOLTI D'AREZZO, FLORENTINE LAWYER,
HUMANIST AND CHANCELLOR

ROBERT DALE BLACK

SEPTEMBER, 1974



ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to study the life and works of the Florentine lawyer, humanist and chancellor, Benedetto Accolti d'Arezzo, who lived from 1415 to 1464. The first chapter is a history of the Accolti family before about 1430. In Chapter II Accolti's early life and works are discussed. Chapter III is an account of Accolti's career as first chancellor of Florence from 1458 until his death in 1464. Chapter IV presents an analysis of Accolti's dialogue De prestantia virorum sui evi. In Chapter V Accolti's history of the First Crusade, De bello a christianis contra barbaros gesto is related to Florentine diplomacy in the eastern Mediterranean. Chapter VI contains a study of Accolti's use of sources in De bello and a discussion of its place in the classical tradition of historiography.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank, in the first instance, my supervisor, Professor Nicolai Rubinstein of Westfield College, University of London for his guidance in my study of Benedetto Accolti. I should also like to thank the United States-United Kingdom Educational Commission for a Fulbright Scholarship which enabled me to begin my research. I should also like to express my gratitude to the Central Research Fund of the University of London for helping to defray the expenses of one of my visits to Italy. Lastly, I should like to thank my wife for her encouragement and for her helpful criticisms of my work.

CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION	6
CHAPTER I: The Early Accolti	8
CHAPTER II: Accolti's Early Life and Works	40
CHAPTER III: Accolti's Career as Chancellor of Florence	69
CHAPTER IV: Accolti's <u>Dialogus de prestantia virorum sui evi</u>	120
CHAPTER V: Accolti's History of the First Crusade and Florentine Diplomacy in the East	151
CHAPTER VI: Accolti's <u>De bello</u> and the cla- ssical tradition of historio- graphy	174
CONCLUSION	241
APPENDIX I	
Table I: Commercial investments of the richest men in Arezzo according to the Catasto of 1427-9	243
Table II: The distribution of wealth in Arezzo according to the Ca- tasto of 1427-9	246
Table III: Distribution of wealth a- mong lawyers in Arezzo according to the Catasto of 1427-9	247
Table IV: The population of the city of Arezzo	248
APPENDIX II: Two versions of the Pratica of 24 February 1461	251
APPENDIX III:	
A. Accolti's letter to Cosimo de' Me- dici, 30 July 1459	
B. Accolti's letter to King René on behalf of Bernardo da Castiglion- chio, 30 July 1459	255
APPENDIX IV: Pratica concerned with increa- sing Accolti's salary as chan- cellor	257
APPENDIX V: Cosimo de' Medici's attitude to Pius II's crusade	259
BIBLIOGRAPHY	260

ABBREVIATIONS

ASA	Archivio di Stato, Arezzo
ASF	Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASV	Archivio di Stato, Venice
BCA	Biblioteca Comunale, Arezzo
B.Mar.	Biblioteca Marucelliana, Florence
BNF	Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence.
Bibl. Laur.	Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence
Bibl. Ricc.	Biblioteca Riccardiana, Florence
CP	Consulte e Pratiche
El. ed Istruz.	Elezioni ed Istruzioni
Harl.	Harlean
Leg. e Com.	Legazioni e Commissarie
Magl.	Fondo Magliabecchiano
MAP	Mediceo avanti del Principato
Miss.	Missive, I ^a Cancelleria
Not. antecos.	Notarile antecosminiano
Panciât.	Fondo Palatino, Serie Panciatica
Pol. Gar.	Poligrafo Gargani
Provv.	Provvisioni, Registri
Resp.	Responsive, Copiari
Risposte d'oratori	Risposte verbali di Oratori
Senato Secreti	Senato, Deliberazioni, Secreti, Registri

N.B. In the first instance titles will be given in full, thereafter, in shortened form. The full titles of all works cited may be found in the bibliography.

INTRODUCTION

Of all the distinguished humanist chancellors of Florence, Benedetto Accolti has received the least notice in modern scholarship. His life and career have been summarized by D. Marzi in his history of the Florentine chancellery,¹ by F. Flamini in his account of Tuscan poetry during the early Renaissance,² by L. Martines in his study of the social position of the Florentine humanists,³ and by A. Petrucci in the Dizionario biografico degli Italiani.⁴ Aspects of his work as a humanist have been discussed by H. Baron,⁵ J. Seigel,⁶ C. C. Bayley,⁷ and E. Fueter.⁸ His two major works were republished in the nineteenth century,⁹ and his Italian poetry has recently been published in a critical edition by E. Jacoboni.¹⁰ But there has been no attempt to study his life and works in detail.

1. La cancelleria della Repubblica Fiorentina (Rocca San Casciano, 1910), pp. 229 seq.

2. La lirica toscana del Rinascimento anteriore ai tempi del Magnifico (Pisa, 1891), pp. 267 seq.

3. The Social World of the Florentine Humanists. 1390-1460 (Princeton, 1963), pp. 343-4.

4. Vol. I, pp. 99-101.

5. The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance. Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny (rev. ed., Princeton, 1966), pp. 347, 396, 435-7.

6. Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism. The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom, Petrarch to Valla (Princeton, 1969), pp. 233-7.

7. War and Society in Renaissance Florence (Toronto, 1961), pp. 227-8.

8. Storia della storiografia moderna, tr. A. Spinelli (Naples, 1944), vol. I, p. 28.

9. By G. Galetti in F. Villani, Liber de civitatis Florentiae famosis civibus (Florence, 1847), pp. 105 seq. and in Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux (Paris, 1841-95), vol. V, pp. 529 seq.

10. 'Le rime di Benedetto Accolti d'Arezzo detto anche Benedetto da Pontenano 1415-1464', Studi di filologia italiana, XV (1957), pp. 241 seq.

Perhaps one reason for this neglect has been the apparent absence of promising source material. Accolti failed to collect his own correspondence, and no one else did it for him. As a result, only one of his private letters has survived.¹ And yet, despite this misfortune, adequate sources do exist to reconstruct a full account of Accolti's life. Vespasiano da Bisticci included a life of Accolti in his series of biographies, which is the source of some important information. A number of private letters to Accolti have survived, which shed light on his early career and on his circle of friends. Eighteenth and nineteenth-century antiquarians collected information about him and his family, and many of their compilations survive in Florence and Arezzo. Notarial documents in the Archivio di Stato di Firenze exist which provide important evidence concerning his life and his family. Tax records in Florence and Arezzo give a full statement of his and his family's financial position, and electoral lists in Florence and Arezzo show what communal offices he and members of his family held. Government records exist to document his term of office as chancellor. Most important, all his major works have survived, so that a full study of his contribution to Renaissance thought and letters is possible. In short, there is no reason why Accolti's life and works should not be the subject of detailed research and consideration, and it is the object of the present work to fill the gap.

1. Cf. chapter III below, p. 115 and Appendix III, p. 255.

CHAPTER I: THE EARLY ACCOLTI

Accolti is a surname which was not confined to a particular place in Tuscany during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries;¹ nevertheless the majority of Accolti at that time came from either Florence or Arezzo. The Florentine Accolti took an active part in the political life of the city during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. They were mainly Guelfs and usually were engaged in commerce; they rose along with their party and sometimes became lawyers and physicians, but then died out at the end of the fourteenth century. One branch of these Florentine Accolti were descended from Spinello Accolti, who was matriculated as a merchant in 1235,² and lived in the Sesto of Oltrarno in the parish of San Frediano and in the Borgo San Jacopo.³ They were Guelfs: Maffio di Spinello was chosen 'super guasto fieri faciendo' at the Battle of Montaperti in 1260;⁴ his brother, Accolto di Spinello, was one of the Consiliarii of the General Council in Florence who agreed to the peace with Pisa in 1256;⁵ and, almost sixty years later in 1313, Gherardo di Colto from the Oltrarno was condemned as a rebel by Emperor Henry VII.⁶ Spinello had at least two other sons: Bocca, who is recorded in 1272 as the purchaser of some land in the contado south of Florence;⁷ and Maffia, who was one of the Consiliarii of the General Council in 1280 who swore to abide

1. Delizie degli eruditi toscani, ed. Fr. Ildefonso di San Luigi (Florence, 1770-89), vol. VII, pp. 216, 230, 238, 241; vol. XI, p. 64; BNF, Pol. Gar., 16.

2. ASF, Manoscritti, 348, fol. 13v.

3. Ibid.; G. Richa, Notizie istoriche delle chiese fiorentine (Florence, 1754-62), vol. IX, p. 3.

4. Il libro di Montaperti, ed. C. Paoli (Florence, 1889), p. 75.

5. Delizie, vol. VII, p. 198.

6. Ibid. vol. XI, p. 125.

7. D. M. Manni, Osservazioni sopra i sigilli (Florence, 1739-86), vol. XXVI, pp. 103-9.

by the peace of Cardinal Latino.¹ Other Accolti then living in the Oltrarno were Messer Amato fu di Accolto Accolti,² and Filippo Accolti.³ The Accolti of the Oltrarno may perhaps have been consorti of the Bardi, who also lived in the Oltrarno: one of the neighbours of Nepo di Messer Bardo de' Bardi in 1269 was Guido Accolti,⁴ and perhaps the same Guido, now called Guido Accolti de' Bardi, was elected Podestà of Pistoia in 1297.⁵ Accolti were still living on the south bank of the Arno in the second half of the fourteenth century: Ser Alessandro Colti from the Gonfalone of Drago in Santo Spirito was unsuccessful in the scrutiny for notaries of the Signoria in 1381.⁶

During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries there were also Accolti living in two sesti north of the Arno. Those in the Sesto of San Pietro Scheraggio were usually known as Buonaccolti, and they were Ghibellines: Aimero Bonaccolti, Dino Bonaccolti, and Azzo Bonaccolti stood as mallevadori for some Ghibellines condemned by the Podestà in 1268 and 1302.⁷ Others, who were variously known as Colti, Accolti, or Bonaccolti,⁸ lived in the Sesto of Borgo.

1. Delizie, vol. IX, p. 97.

2. BNF, Pol. Gar. 16.

3. ASF, Manoscritti, 348, fol. 13v.

4. Delizie, vol. VII, p. 209.

5. Le consulte della Repubblica Fiorentina, ed. A. Gherardi (Florence, 1896-8), vol. II, pp. 592-3.

6. Delizie, vol. XVI, p. 252.

7. Ibid. vol. VIII, pp. 239, 248; vol. X, p. 114. Lapus quondam Cusii Bonaccolti populi S. Petri Scheradii was paid by the commune for the use of his house as a prison for Aretines in 1289 (ibid. vol. IX, p. 289).

8. Cino was called Accolti (B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 212v), Bonaccolti (R. Davidsohn, Geschichte von Florenz / Berlin, 1896-1927 7, vol. II, ii, p. 234) or Colti (Delizie, vol. IX, pp. 52, 332); Vanni was called Accolti or Colti (B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 218v; Delizie, vol. XI, p. 125); Messer Filippo, Accolti or Buonaccolti (B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 229v, 133r; Marchionne di Coppo Stefani, Cronaca fiorentina ed. N. Rodolico, Rerum italicarum scriptores, n. s., vol. XXX, part 1 / Città di Castello, 1903 / pp. 124, 131; Messer

They were Guelfs, as they were twice Gonfolonieri of Justice and seven times Priors between 1296 and 1324. Cino, who according to Davidsohn was a merchant, was a Consiliarius of the General Council in 1278,¹ and in 1293 he was elected by the Signoria to be one of the officials 'super extimis et libris.'² In 1283, he was appointed treasurer of the Romagna by Pope Martin IV,³ and in 1296 he became Gonfaloniere of Justice.⁴ His son Lotto was like his father a merchant, being a member of the Arte della Seta.⁵ Lapo d'Ugo Bonacolti, like Cino, was a Consiliarius of the General Council in 1278, and in 1290 he was appointed masarius camere of the Florentine army.⁶ Caraccio d'Ugo Bonacolti, Lapo's brother, was a prior in 1298,⁷ and Caraccio's son, Cione, was a prior in 1320.⁸ Vanni Acolti was Gonfaloniere of Justice in 1304,⁹ and in 1313 he was condemned as a rebel by Henry VII.¹⁰ Messer Filippo Accolti, Vanni's son, was a doctor of law,¹¹ and was twice a prior, in 1318 and 1322-3.¹² Messer Teghia Buonacolti, a doctor

Teghia, Buonacolti or Colti (B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 228v, 232r, 234r).

1. Davidsohn, Geschichte, vol. II, ii, p. 234; Delizie, vol. IX, p. 52.

2. Ibid. p. 332.

3. Davidsohn, Geschichte, vol. II, ii, p. 234; ibid. vol. IV, ii, p. 298 and Anmerkungen to vol. IV, ii, p. 93.

4. B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 212v.

5. ASF, Arte della Seta, 6, insert 1, fol. 3v. I am grateful to Dr J. Najemy for this reference.

6. Delizie, vol. IX, p. 52; Consulte, ed. Gherardi, vol. I, p. 393.

7. B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 213v.

8. Ibid. fol. 230v.

9. Ibid. fol. 218v.

10. Delizie, vol. XI, p. 125.

11. Stefani, Cronaca, pp. 124, 131.

12. B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 229v, 233v.

of law like Vanni, was a prior three times, in 1317, 1321-2, and 1324,¹ and, at the Parlamento of July-August, 1343, he spoke in favour of appointing the Council of Fourteen to reform the government.² Giovanni Colti is mentioned as one of the Consiliarii who appointed ambassadors to Clement VI in 1342³ and in 1350 Vanni's son, Niccolò, was in Prato.⁴ Cino di Colto was a prior for the minor guilds in 1345; these Accolti, however, disappeared after 1350, with the exception of Buonaccolto di Francesco Bonaccolti from the Gonfalone of Leon Nero, who was unsuccessful in the Scrutiny of 1382 for the Tre Maggiori.⁵

In the sixteenth century the Accolti of Florence were sometimes regarded as ancestors of the Aretine Accolti. In one Priorista, for example, beside the name Caraccio d'Ugo Buonacolti as well as those of other Buonaccolti, the author wrote 'agli Accolti'.⁶ In his Priorista, Messer Giuliano Ricci evidently associated these early Accolti with the Accolti of Arezzo: 'Accolti, o Colti sono spenti,' he wrote, 'et succedono con questo cogniome li Acolti di Arezzo.'⁷ Nevertheless, there is no conclusive evidence to connect these two families. Although the name itself is not common, occasionally someone called Accolto can be found among other families: for example, an Accolto di Bonaccorso Unganelli was mentioned in a document of 1242,⁸ and a Filippo di Accolto Eruari, in 1268.⁹ No particular place of origin

1. Ibid. fol. 228v, 232r, 234r.

2. Delizie, vol. XIII, p. 203.

3. Ibid. p. 188.

4. ASF, Manoscritti, 348, fol. 13v.

5. Delizie, vol. XVI, p. 167.

6. B. Mar., Codex C 1, fol. 213v, 218v, 228v, 229v, 230v, 232r, 233r, 234r.

7. ASF, Manoscritti, 244, fol. 6r; ibid. 240 (another copy), not foliated: 'Accolti, o Colti hoggi sono spent' et succedono gl'Accolti d'Arezzo.'

8. BNF, Pol. Gar., 16.

9. Delizie, vol. VIII, p. 221.

can be associated with the name. Accolti appear in Florence as early as they do in Arezzo or elsewhere in Tuscany.

The first Aretine Accolti mentioned in the sources was Nero Accolti, who is named in the treaty of the League formed in 1251 between Florence and the Guelfs of Arezzo;¹ he was a magnate, having been called in an instrument of 25 August 1254 one of the nobiles viri of Arezzo.² Later Accolti were popolari and frequently belonged to professional guilds: in 1311 Maestro Uberto Accolti Medico is mentioned,³ and in 1345 Ser Accolto.⁴ Perhaps the same Ser Accolto, called Ser Accolto d'Accolto, was mentioned in an instrument of 1315,⁵ but it was another, Ser Accolto del Riccio, who came to Arezzo from Faltona in the Casentino at the end of the thirteenth century and was matriculated in the Arte di Notari of Arezzo.⁶ Ser Accolto del Riccio became a citizen of Arezzo,⁷ and he is known to have died between 1328 and 1333.⁸ Of his three sons, one, Maestro Gregorio, was a physician,⁹ and another, Ser Acolto, was a notary.¹⁰ Although after the time of Nero there were no Accolti in Arezzo known to have been magnates, some of them undoubtedly enjoyed a high social rank. Caterina and Ci-

1. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 1v bis.

2. B. Mar., Codex A 135, fol. 124v.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. Cf. M. Messina, 'Francesco Accolti di Arezzo,' Rinascimento, I (1950), p. 313.

5. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 1v bis.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. In 1328 he witnessed an instrument (ibid.); on 17 December 1333 his sons were called 'quondam Ser Accolti de Aretio' (D. Marzi, La cancelleria della Repubblica Fiorentina / Rocca San Casciano, 1910 / p. 230).

9. ASF, Manoscritti, 348, fol. 13v.

10. BNF, Pol. Gar., 16; Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 230.

cilia Accolti, for example, were sisters of the Convent of Santa Maria di Pionta near Arezzo; many of the other sisters of this convent belonged to famous Tuscan noble families such as the Bardi, Adimari, Cerchi, Boscoli and Sassoli.¹

The earliest known direct ancestor of Benedetto Accolti is Benvenuto, whose son Accolto di Benvenuto d'Arezzo is mentioned in an instrument of 1318.² Accolto di Benvenuto had died before 1336, for in that year his son, Matteo, was called 'Matteus olim Accolti Civis Aretinus.'³ Matteo himself was dead by 1353, when a dispute over the estate he had left was submitted to arbitration.⁴ Matteo had four sons, Santi, Grazia, Ugolino and Ser Donato, three of whom remained in Arezzo: 'Santi, e Grazia di Matteo d'Arezzo' were mentioned in an instrument of procuration in 1366;⁵ 'Gratia et Ugolinus fratres, et filii Mathei Olim Accolti de Aretio' in 1382, in the records of the Ufficiali di Grascia of Arezzo;⁶ and Grazia, et Ugolinus Mathei Accolti de Aretio' in 1371 and 1383 in the Catasto dei Capi di Famiglie of Arezzo.⁷

The Accolti of Arezzo were an unsettled family. Matteo Accolti's other son, Ser Donato, emigrated from Arezzo to Pistoia, where he was a notary.⁸ Grazia di Matteo had two sons, Santi and Ugolino, who like Donato moved away from Arezzo. They settled not in Pistoia, but in Pontenano,

1. ASF, Not. antecos., G 837 (1350-1), fol. 58r.

2. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 1v bis.

3. B. Mar., Codex A 135, fol. 124r.

4. ASF, Not antecos., G 837 (1352-4), fol. 71v, 100r.

5. ASF, B. Mar., Codex A 135, fol. 124r.

6. Ibid. fol. 124v.

7. Ibid.

8. ASF, Not. antecos., A 64, fol. 17v, 19r, 85r; A 65, fol. 1r.

in the Casentino, where on 20 February 1385, when the commune was submitted to Florence, they were each named as citizens of Pontenano.¹ Ugolino di Grazia was said to be from Pontenano in a sentence of 1391² and often both his and Santi di Grazia's children were said to have been from Pontenano.³ The descendants of Matteo di Accolto di Benvenuto were not the only Accolti who left Arezzo during the fourteenth century. Maestro Gregorio di Ser Accolto del Riccio da Faltona had evidently gone to Florence by 1320 since in that year he was mentioned in the matricole of the Arte di Medici e Speciali.⁴ In the 1330's Maestro Gregorio lived and practised in the Sesto di San Pancrazio in the parish of Sant'Appolinare;⁵ and he was still living there in 1351, for in the estimo of that year he was taxed in the Gonfalone of Bue in the Quarter of Santa Croce.⁶ He soon became well-established in Florence, as he was one of the Captains of Orsanmichele in 1324,⁷ and married Lecca di Guido Compagni in 1337, receiving a dowry of 270 florins.⁸ In October, 1346, however, he was one of those affected by a law directed against foreigners who were said to have illegally emigrated to Florence; they were now to be excluded from public office in Florence.⁹ Understandably,

1. ASF, Capitoli, 52, fol. 99r. Pontenano is located on the Alpe di Santa Trinita, about 10 miles northwest of Arezzo.

2. B. Mar., Codex A 135, fol. 124v.

3. For example, cf. ASA, Estrazioni, VI, fol. 56r, 159r, 163r, 229v; VII, fol. 52r; Statuti della Università e Studio Fiorentino, ed. A. Gherardi (Florence, 1881), pp. 414, 440.

4. ASF, Manoscritti, 348, fol. 13v.

5. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 230; BNF, Pol. Gar. 16.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. ASF, Provvisioni, Registri, 34, fol. 93v-94r; ibid. 211, fol. 126v. I am indebted to Dr J. Najemy for these references

Maestro Gregorio never gave up all ties with Arezzo, and in an instrument of 17 August 1353 he is recorded as the purchaser of a house in Arezzo in the Quarter of Porta di Foro, and in the Borgo Marcialani.¹

Conditions in Arezzo may have had an unsettling effect on the Accolti. During most of the thirteenth century Arezzo had been prosperous and the commune had been growing stronger. In 1203, the Bishop of Arezzo was compelled to live within the city, and subsequently other ecclesiastical magnates had to submit to the commune. Arezzo was increasing its control over the countryside, and conquered Cortona and Città di Castello by 1260.² Although Arezzo never became an important commercial centre such as Florence or Siena, its cloth industry was developing, and a special technique in silk weaving was called the manera aretina.³ The commune built the Palazzo del Comune in 1232 and the Palazzo del Popolo in 1278; a new cathedral was begun, and new churches, including San Francesco, San Agostino, and San Domenico, were built; in 1194 work was begun on extending the walls of the city.⁴ Chroniclers recorded that contadini were moving into the city;⁵ and among them were probably the Accolti da Faltona. But while the city was expanding, the Aretines were involved in wars with neighbouring communes, and in 1289 they were decisively defeated by Florence at Campaldino. During the following thirty years, the leading families of Arezzo were divided by fac-

1. ASF, Not. antecos., G. 837 (1352-4), fol. 89r.

2. M. Falciai, Storia di Arezzo dalle origini alla fine del Granducato Lorenese (Arezzo, 1928), pp. 95-6.

3. H. Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century,' Traditio, IX (1953), pp. 338-9, n. 68; G. Lazzeri, Aspetti e figure di vita medievale in Arezzo (Arezzo, 1937), pp. 108-12; Davidsohn, Geschichte. Anmerkungen und Exkurse zum zweiten Teil, p. 11.

4. Falciai, Storia, pp. 15, 17; A. Castri and A. Paolini, Arezzo. Illustrated Artistic Guide (Milan and Rome, 1959), p. 13.

5. Annales Aretinorum Maiores, ed. A. Bini and G. Grazzini, Rerum italicarum scriptores, n.s., vol. XXIV, part 1 (Città di Castello, n.d.), p. 9.

tional struggles, which were intensified by the almost incessant warfare between Arezzo and Florence. Two factions, called the Verdi and the Secchi, emerged, and eventually in 1312 the Secchi, led by the Bishop of Arezzo, Guido Tarlati da Pietramala, prevailed. It was during these unsettled times that Maestro Gregorio di Accolto emigrated from Arezzo to Florence. Under the rule of Guido Tarlati conditions improved. But Pier Saccone Tarlati, who became Signore after his brother Guido died in 1327, was not so successful a leader, so that finally in 1337, threatened by armies from Perugia and Florence and by plots among the leading citizens of Arezzo, he sold the city to Florence for ten years. In July 1343, when Florence rebelled against Walter of Brienne, the Aretines, learning of the rebellion, rose and established an independent Guelf regime under the government of a Council of Sixty. The new regime was continually attacked by the Tarlati, who had remained in exile, and after 1375 was divided by disputes among the Guelfs of Tuscany during the War of the Eight Saints. During these confused times from 1343 until 1384 when Arezzo was again sold to Florence, Benedetto Accolti's ancestors, Santi di Grazia and Ugolino di Grazia, emigrated from Arezzo to the Casentino. Some of the Accolti of the early fourteenth century had in fact been Ghibellines: in 1311, Maestro Uberto Accolti Medico, and in 1345 Ser Accolto were named as Ghibellines.¹ This suggests that Santi and Ugolino Accolti may have had political reasons for emigrating to the Casentino after 1343, when Arezzo had come under a Guelf regime.

Ugolino di Grazia, however, did not stay in Pontenano. Sometime after 1391,² he moved to Perugia, and lived there together with his sons, Michele and Paolo, born in 1389 and 1392.³ Michele and Paolo returned to Arezzo in 1426, where they were citizens, having been taxed together with

1. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 1v bis.

2. B. Mar., Codex A 135, fol. 124v.

3. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 768r-768v.

other citizens of Arezzo in 1427.¹ They had neither a profession nor a business, and the value of all their possessions reported in the Catasto did not exceed a few hundred florins.² They still had some ties with Pontenano, where they owned a piece of land and rented a house from a Messer Cristofano di Bandino.³ They had a piece of land too in the corte di Mammi, about seven and a half miles south of Arezzo, and two more pieces in the corte of Staggiano, two miles east of Arezzo.⁴ Except for Pontenano, however, their lands were not in the same part of the contado as those of Santi di Grazia's descendants, which were northeast of Arezzo, closer to Pontenano.⁵ Paolo's descendants came to be known as the Forzoni; they had little to do with the descendants of Santi di Grazia until the seventeenth century, when they claimed to be their heirs.⁶

Santi di Grazia had two children, Grazia, born in 1363,⁷ and Michele, born in 1375,⁸ who was Benedetto Accolti's father. Grazia did not have a profession, and he may not have been literate, since in 1427, after their household had been divided, his portata for the Catasto was still written by Michele.⁹ Michele, on the other hand, went to the Studio at Bologna to study law. On 15 February 1399 he was examined privately in civil law by Messer Giovanni di Lapo, Messer Giovanni di Canitulo, and others, and was unanimously passed. Five days later, on 20 February he had a conventus or public examination in San Pietro in

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. fol. 768r.

4. Ibid.

5. Cf. below pp.

6. B. Mar., Codex A 135, fol. 119r-127r.

7. ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 628r-631v.

8. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 359v.

9. Ibid. fol. 351r-359v; ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 628r-631v.

Bologna from the same doctors.¹ Michele may also have had a doctorate of canon law, but it is not known where or when it was conferred.² It is not surprising that Michele became a lawyer, for in the fourteenth century many Accolti had been professional men: Maestro Uberto and Maestro Gregorio di Ser Accolto had been physicians, and Ser Accolto del Riccio, Ser Accolto d'Accolto, and Ser Donato di Matteo had been notaries.

To Grazia and Michele, Santi di Grazia left a house and a number of pieces of land in Pontenano.³ These consisted of four arable plots, four areas of timber, one mixed plot, four meadows, four vineyards, and a paddock. These lands were held in perpetual lease from the Fraternity of Santa Maria of Arezzo for three staia of grain a year, and each year they were subject from the commune of Pontenano to a decima of one and a quarter staia of grain, to be paid to the Church of Pontenano.⁴ Most of Grazia's and Michele's other lands were in the Casentino too. In 1418 they had in common some properties at Salutio in the Val d'Arno Casentinese beside the Torrente di Salutio, four miles northwest of Pontenano and two and a half miles east of the Arno.⁵ In his own name, Michele had some properties at Tulliano in the Val d'Arno Casentinese, beside the Arno, one and a quarter miles northeast of Salutio,⁶ and at Lorenzano, two miles farther south along the Arno.⁷ At Bagnena, beyond the Arno valley in the foothills of the Alpe della Badia

1. Il 'Liber secretus iuris caesarei' dell'Università di Bologna, ed. A. Sorbelli (Bologna, 1938-42), vol. I, p. 127.

2. In 1427 some of his law books were 'libri. . . di decretali.' Cf. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 359r.

3. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 574r.

4. Ibid. fol. 574r-574v.

5. Cf. Ibid. fol. 574v-575r; C. Beni, Guida illustrata del Casentino (Florence, 1889), enclosed map.

6. Ibid.; ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 575r-576r.

7. Ibid. fol. 576r-576v.

di S. Trinita, five miles west of the Arno and two and a half miles east of Pontenano, Michele had nine poderi, four let on short-term leases and five on perpetual leases.¹ In common with Giovanni Francesco da Valenzano, Michele had some properties at Poggibaldi, near Tulliano.² Michele's and Grazia's properties at Bagnena and Pontenano were typical of the hills of the Casentino, largely meadow, forest and vineyard, with some arable lands. Their property at Salutio, Tulliano, Lorenzano, and Poggibaldi, on the other hand, was typical of the Val d'Arno Casentino, mainly arable, with some vineyards and pastures.³

Sometime between 1418 and 1423, Grazia and Michele divided their household.⁴ Grazia took most of their property at Pontenano,⁵ and the remaining lands at Pontenano were held in common, Grazia receiving two thirds of the profits, Michele one third.⁶ Grazia received all of the lands at Salutio and Michele all those at Poggibaldi, Tulliano and Bagnena, which had previously been in his own name.⁷ In 1427 Michele's properties in the Casentino were largely the same as they had been in 1418, but he no longer had any property at Tulliano or Lorenzano.⁸ It is possible that he had exchanged his lands at Lorenzano with Giovanni di Francesco da Valenzano: except for two pieces of arable land, he held in his own name all the lands which he had previously owned in common with Giovanni; and Lorenzano is just across the Arno from Valenzano, a mile and a quarter closer than Tulliano.⁹

1. Ibid. fol. 576v; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 355v-358v.

2. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 575v-576r.

3. A. Mori, 'Casentino', Enciclopedia Italiana, vol. IX (Milan, 1931), p. 299.

4. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 41, 3, fol. 212r.

5. Ibid. fol. 212r-213r.

6. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 355r.

7. Ibid. fol. 353r-354v; ASA, Catasto, Ser. 41, 3, fol. 212r-213r.

8. Ibid. Ser. 42, 3, fol. 575r-576v; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 353r-354v.

9. Cf. Beni, Guida del Casentino, enclosed map; ASA,

Michele found farming in the Arno valley more profitable than in the hills of the Casentino. In 1427 his properties at Tulliano and Poggibaldi yielded the largest crops. Those at Tulliano were worked by Marco di Lando da Valenzano for the loan of 10 florins 2 lire, a pair of oxen worth 18 florins, and 16 staia of grain, and they rendered 100 staia of grain, and ten barrels of wine a year.¹ Those at Poggibaldi were worked by Antonio di Donato dagli Amano and his son Donato for the loan of 12 florins, 37 staia of grain, a pair of oxen worth 16 florins, and twenty small animals; they yielded 100 staia of grain and 5 barrels of wine a year.² On the other hand, for all his properties at Bagnena, which together comprised a considerably greater area than his lands at Poggibaldi and Tulliano, he received a rent of only 72 1/2 staia of grain a year.³ Michele's lands at Pontenano, like those at Poggibaldi and Tulliano, yielded very little. They had yielded 14 staia of grain a year, but in 1427 Michele reported that they had become 'sodi et non lavorali.'⁴ Even today the contrast between the land in the Val d'Arno Casentinese and the hills of the Casentino is striking. The Arno valley in the Casentino consists of good, low-lying, arable land, well irrigated and adequately provided with top soil. The hills of the Casentino, on the other hand, are rocky and sparsely cultivated, with a thin layer of top soil.

Pontenano, moreover, is only accessible by a winding, rocky road, which during much of winter must have been closed and even today is difficult to use. Pontenano and the rest of the hills of the Casentino, so remote and so poorly provided with good farm land, had little to offer Michele and Grazia, and shortly after 1400 they did, in fact, return

Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 575v-576r; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 354r-354v.

1. Ibid. fol. 353v.

2. Ibid. fol. 354v.

3. Ibid. fol. 355v-358v.

4. Ibid. fol. 355r.

di S. Piero, and Michele's was put in the borse of the Rectors of the Fraternity of Santa Maria della Misericordia, of the Captains of the Guelf Party for the Mezzo di S. Piero, and of the Council of Sixty for the Mezzo di S. Piero.¹ Michele first had an office when after 1 July 1413 he became a member of the General Council for six months.² In 1416, he was elected an ambassador to Florence, for which he received 45 florins from the Priors for fifteen days service.³ In 1417 he again became a member of the General Council, and in 1418 he was first drawn as one of the Guelfs of the Council of Sixty.⁴ During March and April, 1418, Michele first became a prior, Rinaldo di Masto di Messer Lando, Battista de' Altucci, and Donato di Niccolò; standing surety for him.⁵ Grazia first had an office when after 1 September 1418 he became a member of the General Council for six months.⁶ In 1418 Michele was drawn for the Council of Sixty, but because he had been a member the previous year, he could not hold the office, and his polizza was returned to the borsa.⁷ During July and August 1419, Grazia first became a Prior, Messer Guido di Agnolo da Subbiano, Ser Brizio di Gherardo, and Ser Paolo Fei Notaro standing surety for him;⁸ in 1419 he was one of the four officiales examinatum dotarum et bonorum.⁹ Michele was again a member of the General Council in 1420-1,¹⁰ and in 1421-2 he was one of the Guelfs of the Council of Sixty.¹¹

1. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 3r-3v.

2. ASA, Estrazioni, VI, fol. 56r.

3. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 6v.

4. ASA, Estrazioni, VI, fol. 132v, 146r.

5. Ibid. fol. 145r, 149r.

6. Ibid. fol. 159r.

7. Ibid. fol. 163r.

8. Ibid. fol. 184v, 187r.

9. Ibid. fol. 190r.

10. Ibid. fol. 229v.

11. ASA, Estrazioni, VII, fol. 14v.

During July and August 1424 Michele was a prior for the second time, Messer Benedetto di Gianozzo, also a doctor of law, Giovanni di Niccolò Sinigardi, and Mariotto di Conte standing surety for him.¹ In 1424 Michele stood surety for Gabriele di Tomaso di Messer Lando as a prior.² The Accolti, however, were not so prominent in public life as old Guelfs such as the Albergotti, nor was Messer Michele so eminent a figure as Angelo di Paolo Lippi, who between 1389 and 1427 was a prior eleven times, a Captain of the Guelf Party nine times, a member of the General Council eight times, and a member of the Council of Sixty three times.³ The Accolti played a moderate part in political life, similar, for example, to that of the Marsuppini, who had been an established Guelf family in Arezzo since the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁴ There were nine Marsuppini who held office before 1427, having been seven times priors, twice Captains of the Guelf Party, and thirteen times members of the General Council.⁵ Michele and Grazia, during the same period, were the only Accolti who held office, and they were three times prior, four times members of the General Council, and twice members of the Council of Sixty.

Messer Michele, at the same time, was one of the richest men in Arezzo. In the Catasto of 1427 he had a

1. Ibid. fol. 52r.

2. Ibid. fol. 69r.

3. ASA, Estrazioni, I, fol. 2v, 14r, 17r, 65r, 67r, 110r, 117v; ibid. II, fol. 47r; ibid. IV, fol. 48v, 54r, 77r, 108r, 123r, 128r, 146r; ibid. V, fol. 14v, 19v, 23v, 53r, 96v, 148v, 164r, 164v; ibid. VI, fol. 86v, 105v, 142r, 174r, 108v, 117r, 129v; ibid. VII, fol. 2r.

4. Cf. Falciai, Storia, p. 157. They had emigrated from Quarata in the Cortine di Arezzo at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Cf. U. Pasqui and U. Viviani, Guida illustrata storica, artistica e commerciale di Arezzo e (Arezzo, 1925), pp. 211-2.

5. ASA, Estrazioni, IV, fol. 131v; ibid. V, fol. 28v, 38v, 45v, 53r, 57r, 80v, 99r, 114r, 116v, 164r; ibid. VI, fol. 5v, 10r, 79r, 96r, 118r, 190r; ibid. VII, fol. 31v, 54v, 68v, 75v, 83r, 120v.

valsente of 1584 florins, 9 soldi.¹ He was thus the fourteenth richest man in Arezzo, which meant that he was one of the richest 1.2% of Aretines taxed. (Cf. Appendix I, Tables I and II) Michele was the second richest lawyer in Arezzo: he had a valsente not nearly so large as Messer Gregorio Marsuppini, but one almost twice as large as the third richest lawyer, Messer Benedetto di Giovannozzo.

1. The Catasto in Arezzo was a means of determining wealth to be taxed in the estimo or lira; in Florence, on the other hand, it was a means of establishing liability to forced loans (prestanze). In Arezzo the Catasto was first instituted in 1418 (not in 1422 as is stated by P. Varese, 'Condizioni economiche e demografiche di Arezzo nel secolo xv,' Annuario del R. Istituto Magistrale di Arezzo, I /1924-57, p. 39); in Florence, on the other hand, in 1427. Aretine residents and citizens were required to submit a portata of all their capital assets and liabilities; liabilities were then subtracted from assets and the remainder, known as the valsente, was the basis for determining the tax. After 1427, Aretines like Florentines were allowed to subtract the value of their house from their assets, but unlike Florentines they were never allowed to deduct an allowance for each member of their family. In both Florence and Arezzo, income was considered to be 7% of the valsente; in Florence, prestanze were levied at the rate of .5% of this income. In Arezzo the procedure for determining the estimo or lira was completely different. In the first place, before 1490 only 80% of an Aretine's valsente was subject to taxation; after 1490, 75%. Before 1427 the rate of taxation was 1 florin for every 540 florins of this portion of the valsente; after 1427, 1 florin for every 600 florins. This meant that an Aretine had to pay in tax 1 out of every 37 4/5 or 42 florins of his income, that is, 2.2% or 1.9%. The lira was usually collected twice a year, so that an Aretine's tax amounted to 4.4% of his annual income before 1427, and 3.8% after 1427. These were official rates of taxation; they were subject to the discretion of the Ufficiali della Lira and sometimes varied in individual cases. Aretines, therefore, were more harshly taxed than Florentines on three accounts: (1) theirs was an actual tax, not a forced loan eventually to be refunded at interest; (2) they were not permitted a family allowance; (3) their rate was higher: 3.8 or 4.4% in contrast to .5%. On Aretine taxation in the fifteenth century, cf. Varese, 'Condizioni', pp. 39-49. For a system of taxation similar to the one used in Arezzo, cf. E. Fiumi, Storia economica e sociale di San Gimignano (Florence, 1961), p. 176. For more examples of heavier taxation in the Florentine dominions than in Florence itself, cf. A. Molho, Florentine Public Finances in the Early Renaissance. 1400-1433 (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), pp. 28 seq.

(cf. Appendix I, Table III) Grazia, on the other hand, had a valsente of only 458 florins.¹

The value of Messer Michele's house was comparable with that of other rich Aretines and is an indication of his position in Arezzo. When he was not in Arezzo he usually let his house for 10 florins a year, which meant that it was worth about 140 florins. There were two shops beneath his house, one let to Antonio di Ceccho, a lanaiolo, for 5 florins a year, the other, to Agnolo called El Paccia, a farrier, for 3 florins a year.² His house, together with the shops, was therefore worth about 250 florins. Similarly, Giovanni di Ser Antonio, who in the 1427 Catasto had a valsente of 1015 florins, had a house and three shops worth 200 florins, and Mona Mattea di Simone di Ghino, who had a valsente of 1705 florins, had a house and two shops worth 250 florins.³

In 1408 Michele married Margherita, the daughter of the well-known lawyer, Messer Rosello di Ser Fino Roselli of Arezzo.⁴ Rosello had become a doctor of civil law at Bologna,⁵ where he lectured during the 1380's.⁶ He lectured too in Florence, during 1390 and 1391, 1394 and 1398.⁷ By March 1391 he had become a Florentine citizen, and by 1393 he was practising in Florence, and had become a member of the Arte dei Giudici e Notai.⁸ Nevertheless, he and afterwards his sons continued to live in Arezzo, and all of their property was still in and around Arezzo.

1. ASF, Catasto, 273, fol. 22v.

2. Ibid. 201, fol. 351r.

3. Ibid. 203, fol. 665r; ibid. 201, fol. 769r. Cf. also Varese, 'Condizioni', p. 153.

4. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 3r.

5. Ibid.

6. L. Martines, Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence (Princeton, 1968), p. 498.

7. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 357-8, 359-60, 362-3, 371, 372.

8. Ibid. pp. 357-8; Martines, Lawyers, p. 498.

Michele received a dowry of 300 florins from Rosello; such a sum was a considerable dowry in Arezzo during the fifteenth century and was indicative of the respect commanded there by Michele. Admittedly, the richest man in Arezzo, Gregorio Marsuppini, received a larger dowry of 600 florins for his Genoese wife.¹ But most rich Aretines expected to provide about 300 florins for their daughters. Piero di Giovanni di Ser Agnolo, one of the thirty-five men *d/* having a valsente of 100 florins or more in the 1427 Catasto, had to restore a dowry of 240 florins to his mother.² 'And further I shall soon be obliged to marry my grown daughter,' wrote the silk merchant Buono di Giovanni, another of the richest men in Arezzo, to the Catasto officials. 'She will cost me, in providing a dowry and paying the expenses of the wedding, about 400 florins.'³ According to a later report, her dowry was 300 florins;⁴ and Buono's estimate was not excessive, as wedding costs were often about 100 florins.⁵

Michele's marriage to Margherita Roselli may be regarded as an indication of his position in Arezzo, for the Roselli were an old and well-established Aretine family. In the fourteenth century Ser Bartolomeo di Ser Gorello said that they were one of the most notable families of Arezzo,⁶ and a street in the Quarter of Porta di Borgo was called the Borgo dei Roselli.⁷ In the early fifteenth century,

1. ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 647v.

2. Ibid. 202, fol. 176r.

3. Ibid. 200, fol. 732r: 'E più o d'incaricho la mia fanciulla grande da marito del tempo. . . la quale mi chos- tarà in darli la dota et mandarla a marito circha a fiorini 400 d'oro.'

4. Ibid. fol. 738v.

5. Cf. for example ibid. 203, fol. 383r: 'A Maestro Lionardo di Messer Giovanni Roselli o promessi per dota di la mia figliola di fiorini cinquecento. . . E per spese mi bisogna per lei per fornimenti et spese fiorini 100.'

6. Cronica, ed. G. Grazzini and A. Bini, Rerum italicarum scriptores, n.s., vol. XV, part 1 (Bologna, 1917), pp. 18-9.

7. ASF, Catasto, 202, fol. 170r; ibid. 810, fol. 737r.

the Roselli were still prominent in Arezzo. In 1427, Maestro Leonardo di Messer Giovanni Roselli, Messer Rosello's grandson, married a daughter of Francesco di Baccio Bacci. The Bacci were a prominent Aretine family; Francesco was, according to the 1427 Catasto, the second richest man in Arezzo,¹ and he gave Leonardo Roselli 500 florins, a large dowry in fifteenth-century Arezzo.²

Michele, moreover, began to acquire property in and around Arezzo. By 1427, he had a few pieces of land in the city and camparie of Arezzo.³ In the city he had a garden in the Contrada delle Carbonaie, for which he received a rent of five lire a year.⁴ In the camparie at Traitone, he had two pieces of arable land, and at the Strada di San Biagio, three more. These two properties were worked by Domenico del Budda d'Arezzo for a loan of 8 florins, and they yielded 50 staia of grain a year.⁵ Michele was also acquiring property in the cortine of Arezzo. Before 1418, he bought a vineyard in the Pieve di San Giovanni a Cappolona, six miles northwest of Arezzo,⁶ for ten florins, and between 1418 and 1427, he bought a house there too. He himself supervised the cultivation of the vineyard, and he used the house as his country home, 'per habitare del detto Misser Michele in villa.'⁷ The vineyard yielded forty barrels of wine a year and thus replaced Lorenzano as the prin-

1. Cf. Table I.

2. ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 383r.

3. The countryside around Arezzo, up to about one mile from the walls, was called the camparie; up to about five miles, the cortine; beyond that, the contado. Cf. G. Rezasco, Dizionario del linguaggio italiano storico ed amministrativo (Florence, 1881), pp. 137, 314.

4. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 576v; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 351r.

5. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 576v-577r; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 351r.

6. E. Repetti, Dizionario geografico-fisico-storico della Toscana (Florence, 1833-45), vol. I, p. 459.

7. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 576v; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 355r.

cipal source of wine for his family.¹ Between 1418 and 1427 Michele also acquired a podere at Milisciano, beside Capolona, six miles northwest of Arezzo.² It consisted of two houses, one with a garden; thirty-four pieces of land, probably arable; a piazza; and a piece of land which was arable, wine-and olive-growing.³ In 1427, he also had two other pieces of land at Milisciano, one arable, the other a vineyard.⁴

Although in many respects, therefore, Michele was an established citizen of Arezzo by 1427, there were still ways in which his position differed from that of the rich Aretine families who had never left the city. In 1427 most of his properties were still in the Casentino, far from Arezzo, so that he had little occasion to be involved in the agrarian life of the city. His lands at Milisciano, moreover, were not very productive, so that his property in the Casentino remained the largest portion of his wealth. From the podere at Milisciano he had received a rent of twenty-eight staia of grain and six barrels of wine, and from the other two plots, six staia of grain and four barrels of wine; but in 1427, apparently owing to a labour shortage, none of his properties there, except a vineyard in the podere, was under cultivation.⁵

Moreover, Michele's wealth in 1418 and 1427 consisted almost entirely of land;⁶ he had no investments in Aretine business and therefore took no part in the commercial life of the city. In the Catasti of 1418 and 1427 he reported a few debts and credits, but they were related to his lands and personal affairs only. Evidently he did not spend sufficient time in Arezzo nor had he a strong enough interest in its commercial affairs to encourage him to play an active role in Aretine economic life. This may have been because

1. Ibid.

2. Repetti, Dizionario, vol. III, p. 213; ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 351v-352v. Michele bought several more pieces of land at Milisciano on 28 January 1428 from Monna Paola fu di Cecco di Menco da Milisciano for 8 florins. Cf. BCA, Cod. 34, fol. 252r.

3. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 351v-352v.

4. Ibid. fol. 352v.

5. Ibid.

6. ASA, Catasto, ser. 42, 3, fol. 577r; ASF, Catasto,

he had only recently come to Arezzo, or it may have been the result of personal disinclination; in either case, it is an example of the limited extent to which he was settled in Arezzo.

Most other rich Aretines, on the other hand, were business men or had investments in business. Of the thirty-five richest men in 1427, twenty-six were engaged in business. (Cf. Appendix I, Table I) Among them were professional men like Messer Michele. Ser Pagolo di Ser Bartolomeo, a notary, had investments in a silk shop and in the business of Giovanni di Ser Antonio; he also placed his nipote in a shop in Pesaro.¹ Messer Gregorio Marsuppini, the lawyer, had a great deal of money invested in the Medici bank, and other important Florentine firms.² Even a nobleman such as Conte Mariotto di Biagio Griffolini, was a partner in an apothecary's shop, a wool shop, a bank and an accomanda at Ancona.³ Exceptional circumstances alone usually prevented rich Aretines from investing in business and taking an active part in the economic life of the city. Of those Aretines who had a valsente of more than 1000 florins in 1427 and who were not engaged in business, one, Antonio da Pantaneto, was an orphan of eight.⁴ Another was an old man of eighty-six. Two were old widows of seventy-five and a hundred.⁵ Two were members of the old Guelf family, the Albergotti, who may have disdained commerce. There were only two others, besides Messer Michele, who were not engaged in commerce.

The location of Michele's house in Arezzo suggests too that he and his family did not have the same standing as families who had lived in Arezzo for many generations. It

1. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 985r, 986r, 988r.

2. ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 644v-647r.

3. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 333r-334r, 335r; ibid. 202, fol. 122r, 123r, 124v.

4. ASF, Catasto, 200, fol. 17r.

5. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 497r, 778r; ibid. 203, fol. 354r, 664r.

was in the Contrada di San Lorentino,¹ near the Porta di San Lorentino, one of the two northern gates of the city.² The Contrada di San Lorentino was located between the site of the old thirteenth-century walls, which today corresponds to Via Garibaldi, and the new fourteenth century walls, which had been built³ by Guido Tarlati.³ This part of the city enclosed a considerable amount of farm land, and in the fifteenth century was still very much the outskirts of Arezzo.⁴ On the other hand, well-established Aretine families such as the Bacci, the Albergotti, the Marsuppini or the Sinigardi, tended to live in the centre of the city within the thirteenth-century walls.⁵

Thus Messer Michele had not fully settled in Arezzo. Admittedly, he held communal offices, he married into a good Aretine family, he had begun to buy property close to the city, and he owned a large house in town. But he still had most of his property in the Casentino, he was not involved in the economic life of the city, and he lived on the outskirts of town. It is not surprising to learn, therefore, that in 1416 Michele was living in Florence, as Maestro Gregorio di Ser Accolto had done in the fourteenth century.⁶ Michele is known to have been practising with Florentine lawyers and to have been employed on cases in Florence. In May 1414, Michele and the Florentine lawyer Paolo da Castro, who was then working on the new Statutes of Florence, were engaged on a dispute between the Conti Gherardesca and the commune of Pisa.⁷ Michele and Gugliel-

1. ASA, Catasto, Ser. 42, 3, fol. 576v.

2. Pasqui and Viviani, Guida, map opposite p. xviii.

3. Falciai, Storia, p. 16.

4. Pasqui and Viviani, Guida, p. 231.

5. Ibid. map opposite p. xviii, and pp. xix, 209, 211-2; ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 657r.

6. BCA, Codex 34, fol. 252r: copy of an instrument of 4 May 1416 attested by Ser Christoforo di Francesco de' Bez-zoli di Arezzo: 'Actum Florentiae in Populo Sancti Apollinari videlicet in domo habitationis. . . Michaelis.'

7. BCA, Cod. 17, fol. 6v; T. Dempster, De etruria regali (Florence, 1723), vol. II, part V, p. 318.

mo di Francesco Tanagli were arbiters in a case sometime after 1424.¹ And on 24 September 1427 in Florence, Michele, Giovanni di Ser Girolamo da Gubbio, Giugliemo di Francesco Tanagli, and Tommaso della Bordella arbitrated a case regarding the Barbolani family from Montauto.² It may be assumed that in 1416 Michele was practising in Florence and by that year he may have been matriculated in the Arte dei Giudici e Notai.³

Michele at the same time was a lecturer in the Florentine Studio. On 24 June 1429 he wrote to Forese Sachetti from Arezzo, asking to be recommended to the new Ufficiali dello Studio.⁴ Two years later on 23 October 1431 Michele was chosen to lecture in civil law for a year with a salary of 130 florins.⁵ His was the highest salary among lecturers in civil or canon law that year, and may be compared with what was earned by other lawyers in the Studio.⁶ Michele's reputation as a lawyer was evidently good, since he had judicial offices outside Florence and Arezzo. In 1429 he was chosen Podestà of Perugia, and while there he was elected Podestà of Volterra, an office which he had to refuse.⁷

Michele lived in Florence because of his profession, but it is interesting to note that both he and Maestro Gregorio di Ser Accolto del Riccio da Faltona had originated in the Cas~~te~~entino, and that both later emigrated to Florence. *d/*

1. BNF, Cod. Magl. VII, 84, not foliated.

2. BNF, Pol. Gar., 16.

3. Martines, Lawyers, p. 501 says that Michele was practising and a member of the guild by 1427.

4. Cf. F. Flamini, La lirica toscana del Rinascimento anteriore ai tempi del Magnifico (Pisa, 1891), p. 578.

5. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 413-4.

6. Cf. G. Brucker, 'Florence and its University, 1348-1434,' Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe. Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison, ed. T. K. Rabb and J. E. Seigel (Princeton, 1969), p. 231.

7. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 6v-7r.

The Casentino consists of the hills and valleys surrounding Arno as it rises in the Monte di Falterona and flows south to Arezzo. One natural egress from this area is to proceed south along the Arno into the valley surrounding Arezzo, and this was the route along which Michele must have gone to visit his lands and bring his produce home to Arezzo. Another outlet equally natural is to proceed north along the Arno in the valley between Monte di Falterona and Pratomagno and continue through this valley to Florence. Messer Michele, living in Florence, could easily have visited his property in the Casentino and have had his farm produce brought directly to Florence.

Economic conditions may have influenced Messer Michele to emigrate to Florence, for under Florentine rule Arezzo suffered a severe depression. After 1384 there was a sharp decline in population in Arezzo. (Cf. Table IV) In 1387 and 1390 the population of the city was probably between 6500 and 7000, but by 1393 it seems to have dropped to less than 6000. By 1423 it had fallen even further to about 4500. In 1436 it may have recovered slightly, reaching just over 5000. But by 1443 it fell again to under 4500; it showed a slight recovery in 1458, 1467 and 1480, but by 1490 it had fallen to less than 4000. It was only with the general rise in European population in the sixteenth century that Arezzo returned to its population before Florentine rule. In overall terms, this population decline does not seem to have been the result of the plague; for the death rate seems to bear no relation to the decline of population. Thus between 1390 and 1433, when Arezzo's population fell by at least 2000, the average monthly death rate was about 19. Over the next forty years, however, when the population remained relatively stable, the average monthly death rate was almost exactly the same. Similarly, between 1473 and 1493, when the population fell by about 1000, the rate was 27.35 per month, but between 1493 and 1533, when the monthly death rate was 32.81 the population rose to about 5500.¹ Whether the population fall between

1. Based on the statistics given by Varese, 'Condizioni',

1390 and 1420 was the result of political or economic circumstances, it certainly was a major force contributing to economic depression in Arezzo in the fifteenth century.

The clearest evidence of this depression is the fall in the average wealth of households in Arezzo during the fifteenth century:

<u>year</u>	<u>average valsente</u>
1423	455 florins
1436	281 "
1443	250 "
1450	236 "
1458	247 "
1467	204 "
1480	200 "
1490	213 "

As a result of this increasing poverty, the total wealth of the population declined:

1423	529,900 florins
1436	376,500 "
1443	271,500 "
1450	261,750 "
1458	279,750 "
1467	260,250 "
1480	250,250 "
1490	219,200 "

as did the contribution Aretines were able to make to the Estimo:

1423	785 florins
1436	502 "
1443	362 "
1450	349 "
1458	373 "
1467	347 "
1480	339 "
1490	274 "

1

pp. 64-5. Varese's attempt to link population rise and fall with the recurrence of the plague (*ibid.* pp. 55-60), therefore, is belied by his own data. On the depopulation of the Florentine dominions as a whole during this period, cf. Molho, Florentine Public Finances, pp. 24 seq.

1. Based on the statistics in Varese, 'Condizioni' pp. 50 and 62-3. Varese maintained that this decrease in per capita wealth was the result of a fall in real prices during the fifteenth century. (*ibid.* p. 50) His evidence in support of this explanation is very thin indeed (*ibid.* pp. 50, 54); scholars moreover are not able to state with confidence the extent to which the European economic de-

depression affected Aretine trade and industry
1422 residents in the Porta Sant'Andrea and
Borgo, who had 46,455 florins in liquid capital,
Arezzo, the liquid capital possessed by the entire
1490 the second richest man in Arezzo, merely
by 1420's there were signs of commerce consisted mainly
silk cloth manufacturers in Borgo and San'Andrea alone,
trade by 1490 had almost ceased to exist.¹ Even in
the 1420's there were signs of commerce consisted mainly
of local businesses and crafts,² and even the richest Are-
tine were simply successful shopkeepers.³ Francesco di
Baccio, in 1427 the second richest man in Arezzo, merely
owned a general Florentine companies, but he no longer
The richest man, Gregorio Marsuppini, had a great deal of
money invested in Florentine companies, but he no longer
pression of the fifteenth century was accompanied by a fall
in prices, just like an increase in poverty, must be
seen as a sign of the later middle age.⁴ On the decrease in
wealth in the Florentine Public Finances, pp. 26-7.
period, cf. Molho, Florentine Public Finances, pp. 26-7.
Varese, Aspetti e figure, pp. 108-12; F. Melis,
(La funzione di Arezzo nell'economia Petrarca
Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca
di Scienze, n.s., profitti di un mercante del
Costi e ricavi, IV-V (1934), pp. 15 seq.
Saggi di storia economica
di Lettere, Arti e Scienze, n.s., profitti di un mercante del
secoli xiv-xv, pp. 3-15.
Lazzaro Bracci, Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca
di Lettere, Arti e Scienze, n.s., profitti di un mercante del
secoli xiv-xv, pp. 3-15.
reprinted in A. Fanfani, Saggi di storia economica
(Milan, 1936), pp. 3-15.
In 1427 the twenty-six richest Aretines engaged
commerce had seven wool shops, five cloth shops,
the cary's two shoe shops, two banks, one butcher
and one sword-maker's shop, and four persons
nature, three, eight, two, and sixteen of the
shops; one, three, eight, two, and sixteen of the
five businesses were owned by members of the
hold, but only twelve were owned by members
households.

lived in Arezzo.¹ Only two others were engaged in business outside Arezzo: Conte Mariotto di Biagio Griffolini, who was a partner in an accomanda at Ancona, and Paulino di Messer Nicolo, who had debts and credits at Avignon and Rome. Conversely, there was little foreign investment in Arezzo. After more than forty years of Florentine rule, not one Florentine, nor any other foreigner, was a partner in any of the shops owned by the richest Aretines.

Arezzo was a depressed area in the Florentine dominions during the fifteenth century. Aretines were not nearly as rich as Florentines. Only thirty-five Aretines in 1427 had valsenti of 1000 florins or more, in contrast to more than 800 Florentines.² (Cf. Table II) These constituted about 8.3% of taxpayers in Florence, but only 2.8% in Arezzo; in Florence the richest 2.8% had valsenti of 1342 florins or more.³ There was approximately the same percentage of rich men in Arezzo as in other small towns in Tuscany, such as Prato or San Gimignano, where taxpayers having valsenti of 1000 florins or more constituted, respectively, 3.0 and 4.3% of the population.⁴ The valsenti of Aretine lawyers in 1427 reflects the advantages of living in Florence. (cf. Table III) Nine of the eleven lawyers had valsenti of less than 1000 florins, and eight of them had less than 500 florins. Only two had more than 1000 florins:

1. ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 644r: Messer Gregorio was a 'habitore al presente ella cita di Firenze.'

2. Cf. L. Martines, The Social World of the Florentine Humanists. 1390-1460 (London, 1963), p. 35, who says that it was approximately 8.3% in Florence. If there were 10,171 households in 1427 (cf. G. Canestrini, La scienza e l'arte di stato desunta dagli atti ufficiali della repubblica fiorentina e dei Medici /Florence, 1862/, p. 151), then 8.3% of them was more than 800. The valsenti cited by Martines include all deductions and cannot be compared precisely with the valsenti of Aretines (cf. note 1, p. 24 above). If the valsenti of Aretines had included all deductions, there would have been an even greater contrast between Arezzo and Florence.

3. Martines, Social World, pp. 365-378.

4. E. Fiumi, 'Stato di popolazione e distribuzione della ricchezza in Prato secondo il catasto del 1428-9', Archivio storico italiano, CXXIII (1965), p. 286; id. Storia economica e sociale di San Gimignano (Florence, 1961), p. 177.

Gregorio Marsuppini and Michele Accolti. (Cf. Tables I and III) Both, however, were living in Florence. Shop rents were lower too in Arezzo than in Florence. In Arezzo shops were let to and by the richest men for 9 florins or less a year.¹ But in Florence, shops were often let for 30 florins a year.² Guido di Francesco Baldovinetti, for example, had seven shops in the Borgo Santi Apoltioli let for as little as 7 florins or as much as 29 florins.³ In short, there must have been considerable economic pressures on Messer Michele to leave Arezzo in the fifteenth century.

In Florence, Michele first lived in the Parish of Sant'Appolinare in the Quarter of Santa Croce. Sant'Appolinare, or Pulinari, suppressed in 1755,⁴ would today have been at the southern end of Via del Proconsolo, on the north side of Piazza San Firenze, between Via Vigna Vecchia and Via dell'Anguillara.⁵ In 1427 Michele was living in the same area, now near the church of San Procolo, in a house rented from Alessandro Covoni.⁶ San Procolo stood at the

1. Cf. ASF, Catasto, 200, fol. 18r, ibid. 201, fol. 351r, 526r, 550r, 769r, 1010r, 1135r; ibid. 202, fol. 408r; ibid. 203, fol. 346r, 359r, 665r, 696r.

2. G. Brucker, Renaissance Florence (New York, 1969), pp. 24, 282. He mentions a retail cloth shop which was let for 118 florins in 1427.

3. ASF, Catasto, 811, fol. 260r-260v. For further evidence of the depressed state of the economy in the Florentine dominions and Arezzo in particular, cf. A. Molho, Florentine Public Finances, pp. 37 seq.; id. 'A Note on Jewish Money-lenders in Tuscany in the Late Trecento and Early Quattrocento,' in Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron, ed. A. Molho and J. A. Tedeschi, (Florence, 1971) pp. 107-9.

4. Repetti, Dizionario, vol. II, p. 275.

5. R. Ciulini, 'Di una raccolta di antiche carte e vedute della città di Firenze,' L'universo, V (1924), map III.

6. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 359v: 'Et sta al presente el detto Misser Michele in Arezzo a Sam Procolo in casa d'Alessandro Covoni. Pagha di pigione fiorini 30 l'anno.' There was no church of San Procolo in Arezzo. Michele, at the beginning of his portata, said too that he 'habita al presente a Fiorenza. In Arezzo è dela contrada di Ruga Mastra dela Porta di Fuori! . . la quale casa / the one

intersection of Via Pandolfini and Via de' Giral di, a few hundred yards northeast of Sant'Apollinare.¹ Sant'Apollinare was, in fact, the parish in which Maestro Gregorio Accolti had lived in Florence, and it is possible that Michele chose to live there to reestablish his ties with the earlier Accolti of Florence. In a letter to Forese Sachetti, too, he may be seen attempting to establish his position in Florence. 'Perchè questo mio facto per vostra grazia l'avete facto vostro,' he wrote, 'e così l'avete guidato, pregovi che strectamente mi racomandiate ai nuovi Officiali de lo Studio e maximamente a quelli che vi sono più strecti amici; e quando vedete el vostro Podestà nuovo, racomandatemi a lui. So' stato qui alcuno dì, e sabato ritorno a Perugia. Racomandomi a voi, come vostro intimo servidore.'² Forese Sachetti was not one of the leading citizens of Florence,³ but some of Michele's colleagues in the Studio were important men in government: Giuglielmo di Francesco Tanagli, Carlo di Francesco Federighi, and Biagio di Lapo Niccolini.⁴

Nevertheless, Michele remained an outsider in Florence. He never became a Florentine citizen, he held no communal offices, nor did he buy any property in Florence. By Florentine standards, he was a man of modest means. He could not afford or did not choose to have his eldest daughter,

in Ruga Mastra 7 quando el detto Messer Michele è Arezzo, è per suo habitare. Et al presente nella detta casa non habita persona.' Moreover, the Covoni were a well-known Florentine, not Aretine, family, and there was a San Procolo in Florence. Michele mistakenly wrote Arezzo instead of Florence.

1. Ciulini, 'Di una raccolta', map VIII.

2. The letter is published by Flamini, La lirica toscana, p. 578; the autograph manuscript is ASF, Corporazioni Religiose Soppresses dall'Impero Francese, Archivio 78, 325, n. 107. Since Michele asked to be recommended to the Podestà of Florence and referred to his return to Perugia, the letter is to be dated 1429, when he was Podestà of Perugia.

3. Cf. Brucker, Renaissance Florence, pp. 99-100.

4. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 438-40.

Agnesa, marry a Florentine. In 1427 she married Giovanni d'Agnolo di Pietro da Castiglione Aretino with a dowry of 300 florins and a trousseau worth 60 florins.¹ In Florence Agnesa's 300 florins would have been a small dowry, but in Arezzo it was a respectable sum. For in the early fifteenth century dowries even among the rich in Arezzo were usually about 300 florins; but by the fourteenth century, dowries of rich Florentines were often larger. The dowries of the Medici in the fourteenth century, for example, were usually between 400 and 1000 florins.² By the middle of the fifteenth century, however, they were usually at least 1000 florins and often much larger.³ Alessandra Strozzi regarded 1000 florins as an 'artisan's dowry', although she herself provided her daughter with no more.⁴

There were other Aretines like Michele who lived in Florence while retaining ties with Arezzo. Gregorio Marsuppini still had all his property in the cortine and camparie of Arezzo, at Quarata, Montione, Viccione-Maggio, Molino del Ponte Buriano, and outside of the Porte di Colcitrone and San Lorentino.⁵ Leonardo Bruni, although he had become a Florentine citizen, had two houses in Arezzo and at least one large estate at Quarto outside Arezzo.⁶ Although they were Florentine citizens too, the sons of Rosello di Ser Fino Roselli, Michele Accolti's brothers-in-law, in 1427 still had their property in Arezzo and the Aretino. Messer Antonio di Rosello had a house in Arezzo, and lands in Valorosa, San Anestagio, and Castiglione Aretino;⁷ he had no property outside of the Aretino until about

1. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 359v.

2. G. Brucker, 'The Medici in the fourteenth century,' Speculum, XXXII (1957), p. 11.

3. Martines, Social World, pp. 37-8.

4. Quoted in ibid. p. 38.

5. ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 643r-647v.

6. Martines, Social World, pp. 117-23.

7. ASF, Catasto, 36, fol. 47r-47v.

1442, when he acquired half of a podere in the contado of Padua as a dowry from his Paduan wife.¹ Bernardo di Rosello lived in Arezzo, where he had a house and some lands, and he had the rest of his property in the contado of Arezzo, at Staggiano, Mulino sott' terra, Cincegli, San Severo, and Gavignano; after 1430 all the land he acquired was in the Aretino; in the 1430's he had a wool and leather shop in Arezzo.² In 1427 Rinaldo and Battista di Rosello lived in Arezzo, where they owned a house in common with their brother Antonio, where Rinaldo had been a partner in a company with Antonio di Nicolo di Manno and was now working for the heirs of Agnolo da Pantaneto, and where Battista was a grain dealer; they had all their property in the contado of Arezzo, at Castiglione Aretino and Bagnaia.³ In 1446 and 1451 Battista was still living in Arezzo, where he was employed as a bookkeeper by Bartolomeo di Donato di Leonardo Bruni, and he still had all his property in the Aretino, now mainly in Subbiano and Catenaia.⁴

Messer Michele di Santi Accolti carried on the traditions of his family: he was a professional man like many of the Accolti of Arezzo during the fourteenth century and like them he moved about between the Casentino, Arezzo and Florence. His son, Francesco, became a lawyer too, and lived moreover in Bologna, Siena, Padua, Ferrara, and Milan, never having settled permanently in one city. The Accolti family traditions were similarly to exert a profound influence on Benedetto Accolti himself.

1. ASF, Catasto, 665, fol. 698r; cf. ASF, Catasto, 358, fol. 42r-42v and 452, fol. 74r.

2. ASF, Catasto, 36, fol. 151r-151v; ibid. 358, fol. 161r-162v; ibid. 452, fol. 155r-155v; ibid. 665, fol. 780r-781r.

3. ASF, Catasto, 37, fol. 1152r-1154v.

4. ASF, Catasto, 665, fol. 64r-65v; ibid. 701, fol. 205r-206v.

CHAPTER II: ACCOLTI'S EARLY LIFE AND WORKS

Benedetto Accolti was born in 1415, the third child of Messer Michele di Santi Accolti and Margherita di Messer Rosello Roselli. His elder brother Antonio was born in 1410 and his sister Agnèsa in 1413. He had three younger brothers: Francesco, born in 1416; Donato, in 1421; and Giovanni, in 1423.¹ His two younger sisters, Tommasa and Nanna, were born between 1427 and 1441.² Two of Accolti's brothers died in their youth: Antonio, between 1430 and 1445³ and Giovanni, between 1454 and 1456.⁴

Benedetto and Francesco were Michele's only children known to have been formally educated and both became lawyers. Arezzo, their native city, had been the home of a great many lawyers and professional men in the later middle ages. The Studio Aretino had been a centre of legal studies in the thirteenth century⁵ and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, even after the Studio had been disbanded, the legal tradition was carried on. Many Aretines lectured in law at Florence, Siena, Perugia and Padua,⁶ and some, such as Francesco Albergotti (d.1376) and Angelo de' Gam-

1. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 359v.

2. Neither was mentioned ibid.; 1441 is the date of Michele's death: cf. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 5v.

3. ASF, Not. antecos., A 45, fol. 15r-15v, where he is mentioned as a witness on 8 March 1430 (ab inc.); ibid. P 290 (1441-6) (not foliated), 29 November 1445, where he is not listed as one of the Accolti brothers who gave their sister Tomasa in marriage to Messer Francesco Lippi.

4. ASA, Catasto, 13 (Porta Foro), fol. 212v seq., where in 1454 he submits his portata together with his brothers; ASF, Not. antecos., S 1190 (unbound, unfoliated busta), where he is not mentioned as one of the brothers dividing Messer Michele's estate on 25 April 1456.

5. Cf. Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning', pp. 322-346 passim.

6. E. Besta, Fonti: Legislazione e scienza giuridica dalla caduta dell'impero romano al secolo decimo quinto (decimo sesto), part 2, in Storia del diritto italiano, vol. I (Milan, 1923), pp. 857-882 passim.

baglioni (d. 1351), achieved great fame. Other professions, such as medicine were widely practised in Arezzo.¹ Benedetto Accolti's own family affords an example of the number of Aretines who were professional men and especially lawyers during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Messer Michele di Santi was a well-known lawyer, and the professional tradition in the Accolti family can be traced back to the early fourteenth century.² His mother's family, the Roselli, were distinguished by even more lawyers and professional men than the Accolti. Messer Rosello, Margherita's father, had been a lecturer in law at the Studio Fiorentino during the 1390's.³ Three of his sons were lawyers: Giovanni,⁴ Francesco,⁵ who practised in Bologna,⁶ and Antonio, who was one of the most famous canonists of the fifteenth century;⁷ one of Rosello's daughters, Fiorentina, also married an Aretine lawyer, Messer Guido di Angelo.⁸ Another of Rosello's sons, Bernardo, was chancellor to Bernardino della Carda in Lombardy.⁹ Among the Roselli of the next generation, Messer Jacopo, Messer Giovanni di Rosello's son, was a lawyer,¹⁰ his brother, Messer Rosello, was a canonist and a clerk of the Apos-

1. Cf. U. Viviani, Medici, fisici, e cerusici della Provincia Aretina vissuti dal v al xvii secolo (Arezzo, 1923), pp. 1-91.

2. Cf. Chapter I above, p. 18.

3. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 357-8, 359-60, 362-3, 371, 372.

4. BNF, Pol. Gar., 1735.

5. ASF, Not. antecos., A. 45, fol. 19r-20v.

6. ASF, Catasto, 359, fol. 870v.

7. Cf. M. Borel d'Hauterive, Le monarque de la sagesse: son tombeau et sa famille (Paris, 1869); G. Pancirolo, De claris legum interpretibus (Leipzig, 1721), pp. 361-4, 444; BCA, Codex 55, fol. 266r-267v.

8. ASF, Not. antecos., A 49, fol. 180r.

9. ASF, Catasto, 37, fol. 1154y.

10. ASF, Not. antecos., A 51, fol. 86v-87r.

tolic Camera,¹ and their brother, Maestro Antonio, was a doctor of medicine, who lectured in the Florentine Studio during the 1430's.² Another of Messer Rosello's grandsons, Messer Giovanni Battista, was a lecturer in law at Florence and Padua,³ and his cousin, Messer Giovanni di Maestro Antonio, was a doctor of both civil and canon law.⁴

It was natural that Benedetto Accolti, coming from this background, chose to study law. Indeed, according to Vespasiano da Bisticci, it was his father's wish that both he and his brother Francesco become lawyers. 'Il padre suo,' he wrote, 'fu solennissimo dottore, et volle che dua figliuoli ch'egli aveva dessino opera alle leggi, et entrassino sotto lui in Firenze, che legeva, condotto dagli uficiali dello Istudio.'⁵ Messer Michele evidently was so solicitous of his sons' education that he wished to supervise it himself in Florence. Benedetto received further help from his father's legal library, which consisted of thirty-six volumes of civil law books, decretals, commentaries and consilia. It was valued at 290 florins and constituted a considerable collection.⁶ Since the Accolti were not a rich family, it must have been a great help to Benedetto not to have to collect his legal texts one by one, but to have them all at his disposal. His father's library, in fact, may have been an important influence leading Benedetto and Francesco to study law, just as collections of law books owned by families such as the Roselli probably contributed to the emergence of generation after generation of lawyers.

1. BNF, Pol. Gar., 1735.

2. Ibid.; Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 414, 419-20, 427-8, 444.

3. Ibid. p. 462.; BCA, Codex 50, fol. 30r, 197r.

4. ASF, Not. antecos., A 55, fol. 148r.

5. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Le vite, ed. A. Greco, vol. I (Florence, 1970), p. 595. All references to Vespasiano's Vite will be to this edition and volume, unless otherwise indicated.

6. ASF, Catasto; 201, fol. 359r.

Benedetto and Francesco completed their studies at Bologna and they took a large part of their father's library with them.¹ Benedetto studied both civil and canon law, and on 20 July 1437 he was given a private oral examination in civil law by Messer Niccolò Ghislardi, Messer Niccolò de' Santi, and Battista da San Pietro. In the examination he was said to have gained great distinction and he was passed unanimously.² He probably took the course to become a doctor of canon law by three years additional study, since he was later called a doctor of both laws,³ but it is not known when he was examined in canon law. Since the public examination in law was only a formality, it was not uncommon to postpone it for several years,⁴ and Benedetto's took place in Bologna on 30 June 1440.⁵

Besides law both Benedetto and Francesco took an interest in letters, and eventually wrote Italian poetry and Latin prose compositions. Both became humanists, and it is in the context of the long intellectual tradition in Arezzo that their predilection for the classics should be understood. In the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries rhetoric had played an important part in the curriculum of the Aretine Studio⁶ and on occasion it may have been taught with unusually extensive reference to classical literature.⁷ Grammar and rhetoric were taught outside

1. ASA, Catasto, 13, fol. 221r, where they state that 90 florins worth of books were lost on their way home from Bologna.

2. Il 'Liber secretus iuris caesaris', ed. Sorbelli, vol. II, pp. 150-1.

3. For example, cf. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 1r; on the three year course in canon law, cf. Martines, Lawyers, p. 82.

4. Ibid. pp. 88-9.

5. Il 'Liber secretus iuris caesaris', ed. Sorbelli, vol. II, p. 174.

6. Cf. Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning', pp. 347 seq.

7. Ibid. p. 382.

the Studio, and boys are known to have learned to read classical authors such as Terence at school.¹ One early fourteenth-century teacher of grammar, Maestro Goro d'Arezzo, wrote an elementary Latin vocabulary list and set of grammar rules,² a treatise on the principles of orthography³ in which he quotes Priscian and Vergil,⁴ and a commentary on Lucan.⁵ From this background emerged Messer Geri di Ser Federigo d'Arezzo, the main figure in the group of pre-humanist classical scholars in Arezzo and Florence during the early fourteenth century.⁶ Interest in collecting manuscripts of classical authors was shown by another Aretine, Ser Simone della Tenca, who in 1338 bequeathed most of his library to the Dominicans of Arezzo. Besides many Patristic and Scholastic works, Ser Simone owned copies of Justin's epitomy of Trogus, of Sallust, of Terence, of Cicero's De officiis, De oratore, De amicitia, Disputationes tusculanae and other treatises and orations, of Palladius' De re rustica, of Seneca's Epistolae morales, and his tragedies with Nicholas of Trevet's commentary, and of such very rare works as Pliny the Younger's letters, Livy's Decades with Nicholas of Trevet's commentary, and Apuleius' De deo Socratis.⁷ Ser

1. Cf. R. Weiss, Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo (Rome, 1949), p. 128.

2. BNF, Panciat. 68, fol. 1r-20r.

3. BNF, Magl. VIII, 1412, fol. 29v-35r.

4. Ibid. fol. 30r, 35r.

5. British Museum, Harl. 1458.

6. On Geri d'Arezzo and his circle, cf. Weiss Il primo secolo, pp. 53 seq.; id. 'Lineamenti per una storia del primo umanesimo fiorentino', Rivista storica italiana, LX (1948), pp. 349-66; id. 'The Dawn of Humanism in Italy', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XLII (1969), pp. 11-2; Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning', pp. 381-2.

7. Cf. U. Pasqui, 'Raccolte di codici in Arezzo', Atti e memorie della R. Accademia Petrarca di Arezzo, VIII (1907-8), pp. 128 seq.; id. 'La biblioteca d'un notaro aretino del secolo XIV', Archivio storico italiano, serie v, IV (1889), pp. 250 seq.; Weiss, 'Lineamenti', p. 358.

Simone may have acquired some of his interest in the classics while living in Verona¹ and that may point to further connections between Veronese and Aretine pre-humanism.² Most important, Ser Simone left almost all of his manuscripts of classical works to the Dominicans, and thereby gave future generations of Aretines the opportunity of studying a wide variety of classical authors while attending the Dominican school.

During the first half of the fourteenth century, the Aretine Studio was disbanded, and despite various efforts to reopen it, it remained closed.³ Nevertheless, the Dominican school continued to function,⁴ and the Commune is known to have employed teachers of grammar and rhetoric.⁵ The tradition of interest in the classics was carried on by the next generation of Aretines. Messer Geri's son, Federigo, wrote Latin verse epistles,⁶ like his father and the Paduan pre-humanists; he corresponded with Petrarch, who sent him a letter (Sen. IV, 5) on the hidden moral significance of Vergil's poetry, a favourite subject of the fourteenth-century humanists; and he composed Italian poems,⁷ one of which is notable for the invectives with which he castigates Florence for having been associated with Catiline.⁸ Another Aretine, Maestro Domenico di

1. Pasqui, 'Raccolte', p. 128.

2. On other such connections, cf. Weiss, 'Lineamenti,' p. 359.

3. Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning', pp. 346-7.

4. Pasqui, 'Raccolte', pp. 142-3.

5. A. T. Hankey, 'Domenico Bandino of Arezzo', Italian Studies, XII (1957), p. 122.

6. Bibl. Laur., Codex 90, 13 (inferiore), fol. 26r; on Federigo, cf. Weiss, Il primo secolo, pp. 59, 66, 105.

7. For them, cf. C. and L. Frati, 'Indice delle carte di Pietro Bilancioni,' Il propugnatore, new series, IV (1891), p. 167.

8. Published by G. Francischini, 'Schede per una storia della cultura aretina nell'età dell'Umanesimo,' Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca di Arezzo, new series, XXXVI (1952-7), p. 292.

Bandino (b. about 1335), a pupil of Maestro Goro's, was a student of classical authors and a friend of Petrarch's and Salutati's.¹ He was an important humanist of the later fourteenth century and composed an enormous encyclopedia, the Fons rerum memorabilium. He taught rhetoric and grammar in Arezzo, and his classical learning may be indicative of the high standards of Aretine education in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. He was notable for his efforts to recover and collect classical manuscripts, an interest which he shared with other Aretines of the later fourteenth century. Maestro Bartolomeo di Giovanni di Ser Marzo, an Aretine doctor of medicine, owned Cicero's De officiis and De inventione and Ovid's Metamorphoses.² Another Aretine, Ser Giovanni Lippi, was asked by Salutati in 1392 for some Ciceronian texts, and was praised by him for his 'maximam copiam librorum.'³ The Commune, moreover, took an interest in preserving books in Arezzo, on one occasion lending money to the Dominicans to put their library in order.⁴

The intellectual tradition in Arezzo reached its climax in the next generation. Leonardo Bruni developed his interest in humanist studies as a boy in Arezzo.⁵ Much Florentine humanism in the first half of the fifteenth century had its roots in Arezzo, and one might add that education in Florence owed much to Arezzo. Arezzo supplied

1. On Domenico di Bandino, cf. Hankey, 'Domenico Bandino', pp. 110-28; id. 'The library of Domenico di Bandino,' Rinascimento, VIII (1957), pp. 177 seq.; id. 'The successive revisions and surviving codices of the Fons Memorabilium Universi of Domenico di Bandino,' ibid. XI (1960), pp. 3 seq.; R. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV (Florence, 1905-14), vol. II, pp. 179-190.

2. Pasqui, 'Raccolte', p. 45.

3. Ibid. p. 46.

4. Ibid.

5. L. Bruni, Rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarium, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XIX, part 3, p. 428.

Florence with many teachers of grammar and rhetoric,¹ and in the Florentine Studio more lecturers were probably employed from Arezzo than from any other Italian city.² In the generation after Bruni's, such an important figure as Carlo Marsuppini belonged to a prominent Aretine family, and even Poggio Bracciolini received his school education after the age of eight in Arezzo.³ The next generation was Benedetto and Francesco Accolti's; together with Girolamo Aliotti,⁴ with whom they formed a humanist circle centred around Arezzo, they carried on the long tradition of classical learning in Arezzo that had continued uninterrupted since the time of Messer Geri.

As a young man in Arezzo Accolti may have had the opportunity of studying classical authors while at school at the Dominican convent. He may have been taught by masters interested in letters such as Domenico di Bandino. He probably knew Leonardo Bruni from an early age, since Bruni's house in Arezzo was in the same street as Accolti's,⁵ and they are later known to have become close friends.⁶ At that time he probably knew Carlo Marsuppini, since both their fathers were Aretine lawyers resident in Florence. Judging from both Benedetto's and Francesco's subsequent predilection for letters, their father Michele probably had an interest in their education extending beyond law to the classics. The Roselli had ties with the humanist movement too. Messer Antonio Roselli, Benedetto's uncle, was the author of several orations,⁷ and Bernardo Roselli,

1. Cf. for example, ASF, Ufficiali dei Pupilli avanti del Principato, VI, fol. 50v.

2. B. Barbadoro, 'Gli umanisti aretini,' Annali della cattedra petrarchesca, VIII (1938), pp. 127 seq.

3. E. Walser, Poggius Florentinus (Leipzig and Berlin, 1914), pp. 6-7, 327.

4. On Aliotti, cf. his Epistolae et opuscula, 2 vols. (Arezzo, 1769) and the life of him by G. B. Scarmali, ibid. vol. I, pp. xiii-xxxvi.

5. Cf. ASF, Catasto, 29, fol. 406r.

6. Cf. below p. 55.

7. Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Codex C 145, fol. 141r-146r, 195r-199v, 291r.

another of Accolti's uncles, was a chancellor, a post often held by humanists in the fifteenth century.

It is not surprising that Benedetto and Francesco Accolti's first steps as students of the classics were taken in composing Italian poetry.¹ Arezzo had had a long tradition of Volgare poets, several of whom, such as Fra Guittone, were leading exponents of the dolce stil nuovo at the beginning of the fourteenth century. A member of the Accolti family in the fourteenth century, Maestro Gregorio, was an Italian poet of some merit,² and the Roselli family was distinguished by several poets in the fifteenth century. A poem on a religious subject has been attributed to Messer Antonio Roselli,³ and Bernardo Roselli wrote a poem recommending the pursuit of virtue.⁴ In the next generation, Messer Giovanni Roselli wrote a consolatory poem on the death of Pellegrino Parenti,⁵ in addition to sonnets and canzoni;⁶ and Messer Rosello, the canonist, sent a sonnet to Giovanni di Cosimo de' Medici,⁷ another to the poet Burchiello,⁸ and a third to Luigi Vettori.⁹

1. On Francesco's poetry, cf. M. Messina, 'Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo,' Rinascimento, I (1950), pp. 300-12; id. 'Le rime di Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo, umanista e giureconsulto del sec. xv', Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LXII (1955), pp. 172-233.

2. On Maestro Gregorio's poetry, cf. A. Ugolino, Gregorio d'Arezzo e le rime (Livorno, 1901).

3. Bibl. Riccar., 1154, fol. 149r.

4. Ibid. 1153, fol. 96v-98r.

5. Ibid. 2823, fol. 109r-110v.

6. Ibid. 1154, fol. 122r-127r, 153r-154v.

7. Ibid. 1114, fol. 204v-205r; BNF, II, II, 40, fol. 119v.

8. Ibid. II, IV, 50, fol. 140v.

9. Ibid. fol. 143v.

Seven of Benedetto Accolti's Italian poems survive,¹ of which six are capitoli in terza rima, and one is a canzone. Four, three of the capitoli and the canzone, are love poems, depicting the successive stages through which the poet is said to have recovered from the ill-effects of an infatuation. Another capitolo is an invective against an anonymous detractor; his longest poem is a verse treatise on the nature of friendship; and his last capitolo is a panegyric of the Virgin. The capitolo on friendship was written as his entry to the Certame Coronario organized by Leon Battista Alberti and Piero di Cosimo de' Medici and was recited on 22 October 1441. The four love poems form a group and were probably written together, before the capitolo on friendship.² The invective was not written much later, since a manuscript of it bears the date 1445-1448.³ The encomium of the Virgin was probably written in 1450, the date ascribed to it in the earliest surviving manuscript.⁴

Neither the canzone on love nor the encomium of the Virgin contains the classical allusions which might point to Accolti's later interests. The canzone has a didactic purpose, but is written in a popular rather than a literary style. In the panegyric of the Virgin, Accolti expresses the rather conventional religious beliefs and sentiments of the later middle ages, attributing vast powers to the Virgin and regarding her, like Christ, as an intermediary between man and God. The poem may have been written for Accolti's confraternity in Arezzo, Santa Maria della Misericordia.⁵

1. They have been published in a critical edition by E. Jacoboni, 'Le rime di Benedetto Accolti d'Arezzo detto anche Benedetto di Michele da Pontenano (1415-1464)', Studi di filologia italiana, XV (1957), pp. 241-302.

2. In the capitolo on friendship Accolti says that 'al tempo degli anni più leggeri, / Quanto seppi d'Amore in rima scrissi.' (Ibid. p. 286) The earliest manuscript containing all four love poems, Codex Riccardiana 1939, is dated 1443-46 (Ibid. pp. 242, 263, 265, 269, 277).

3. Ibid. pp. 242, 282.

4. Ibid. p. 297.

5. Cf. P. O. Kristeller, Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters (Rome, 1956), p. 102.

The rest of Accolti's poems, on the other hand, do demonstrate his interest in classical and humanist literature. In his first love poem, 'Po' che'l cieco furor', use is made of the common classical themes, love's arrow and the blind Cupid (vv. 14, 37-9, 64-7). The torments of Narcissus, whose source was probably Ovid's Metamorphoses II, vv. 346 seq., were also mentioned (vv. 52-60). The second love poem, 'Quell'antico disio', is based on Boccaccio's Amorosa visione, a long didactic poem which was well-known in Florence during the fifteenth century.¹ The part of the Amorosa visione which interested Accolti was the section showing the torments suffered by famous lovers: Accolti's list of famous aggrieved lovers in his capitolo are all derived from this part of the Amorosa visione.² 'Quando el foco d'amor', the third of Accolti's love poems, has been said to derive from vv. 240-88 of Juvenal's tenth satire,³ a passage which is indeed similar to vv. 52-81 of Accolti's poem. But closer examination will show that both Juvenal and Accolti share a common source, namely, the first book of Cicero's Disputationes tuscultanae. Accolti's poem is, in fact, a verse translation of selected passages from that work.⁴ His capitolo on friendship was

1. Edited by V. Branca (Florence, 1944). For its circulation, cf. the list of manuscripts ibid., pp. ix-xvii, which are mostly Florentine.

2. Piramus and Tisbe (vv. 67-9): A.v. xx, 43-88; Narcissus (vv. 70-2): A.v. xxii, 55-63; Tristan and Isolde (vv. 73-4): A.v. xi, 38-51; and xxix, 40-42; Turnus (v. 75): A.v. ix, 31-33; Aeneas (v. 75): A.v. xxxiv, 80-82; Phedra (v. 76): A.v. xxii, 11-27; Dido (v. 76): A.v. xxviii passim and xxix, 1-30; Paris (v. 77): A.v. xxvii, 1-48; Achilles (vv. 77-8): A.v. xxiii, 40-88 and xxiv, 1-42; Pasife (v. 79): A.v. xii, 28-42; Procris (v. 79): A.v. xxii, 64-88; Biblis (v. 80): A.v. xxv, 13-60; Arriana (v. 80): A.v. xxii, 7-24; and Laudamania (v. 82): A.v. xxvii, 52-78.

3. Flamini, La lirica toscana, p. 347.

4. In the satire, for example, Juvenal does not mention Pompei's ignominious flight from Italy, nor the plight of his children, which Accolti takes from Disp. tusc. I, xxxv, 86. Compare:

'Quando el foco'	<u>Disp. tusc.</u> I
vv. 43-5	xxxiv, 84

an adaption into Italian verse of another Ciceronian dialogue, this time the De amicitia.¹ Besides showing his interest in classical literature, Accolti's last poem to be considered, the invective 'O tu che se' di tal superbia pieno', demonstrates his familiarity with classical

46-48	xxxiv, 83
58-95	xxxv-xxxvi, 85-6
109-111	xxxi, 75
120-123	xlvi-xlix, 116
127-138	xxxvii, 89
139-150	xxxviii, 91
157-167	xxxvii, 91-2
179-198	xxxix, 93-4
199-210	xxxix, 94
211-219	xl, 95
220-222	xl, 96
223-228	lx, 97
229-270	lxi, 97-9

Jacoboni, 'Le rime', p. 276 noted that the beginning of the speech by Socrates was modeled on the Disp. tusc. but failed to point out that the rest of the poem was too. She says that Accolti missed the irony in Callimachus' epigram on Cleombrotus, ibid. pp. 270-1, but she should rather have found fault with Cicero, who took Callimachus seriously and whom Accolti was copying (Disp. tusc. I, xxxiv, 84).

1. Compare:

'Se mai gloria'	<u>De amicitia</u>
vv. 61-3	viii, 26; ix, 29-32; xiv, 51
64-75	viii, 27
88-90	v, 19; xxiii, 87-8
91-93	viii, 27; ix, 32; xiv, 51
94-114	ix, 29-32; xiv, 51
117 <u>seq.</u>	vi, 20 <u>seq.</u>
130-2	xxvii, 100
139-47	vii, 28; ix, 29; xiv, 48; xxvii, 100
166-168	vi, 22
190-201	x, 35; xi, 37; xi, 39 - xii, 40; xxi, 79
199-201	xxi, 77-8
220	xxvii, 101
226-8	v, 18
229-246	xx, 74; xxv, 93-4
250-264	ix, 32; xxv, 93-4
265-285	ix, 32
298-324	xvi, 58; xix, 69; xx, 73
325-330	xix, 69; xx, 73
331-336	xviii, 65
337-8	xvii, 63
349-351	vii, 24

rhetoric. For it is a rhetorical amplification of vv. 107 to 124 of Ovid's In Ibin.¹ Amplificatio was a common rhetorical way of embellishing an argument or concluding an oration, and Accolti's poem belongs to the genre of epideictic rhetoric, in which amplifications were frequently used.²

Accolti, however, does not seem to have gone beyond a single source for each of his poems; his poetry demonstrates simply a passing acquaintance with classical literature, rather than a profound erudition. In 'Quell'antico disio,' there is no indication that he used any other source than the Amorosa visione, and in 'Quando el foco', where he might have turned to Juvenal's satires, he seems to have limited himself to Cicero's Tusculan Disputations. In his capitolo on friendship, there is no trace of other works treating of the subject, such as Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, Valerius Maximus' Epitomes, or Seneca's Epistolae morales. Similarly, 'O tu che se' di tal superbia pieno', his only source was Ovid's In Ibin.

If Accolti's poems are modeled on classical sources and make use of the formulae of classical rhetoric, one may doubt the extent to which they were the expression of his own feelings. It has been maintained that he wrote his love poems from experience,³ a conclusion which might be supported by verses with autobiographical reference

1. As noted by Flamini, La lirica toscana, pp. 528-9. Compare:

'O tu che se''		<u>In Ibin</u>
vv.	4-5	vv. 107
	6	109
	7-9	113-4
	10-1	107, 112
	12	111
	14	110
	23	108
	25-6	116
	26-7	118
	34	119
	35-6	123-4

2. On amplificatio, cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, II.xix.30, II.xxx.47-49, III.viii.15.

3. Flamini, La lirica toscana, pp. 418 seq.

such as:

Quando nel primo giovanile stato
Da Dio e da natura fui condotto,
Volsi la mente sotto
Studio di legge e litteral dottrina. . .¹

Nevertheless, the love poems follow an obvious literary convention, each one depicting an emotion experienced as the poet frees himself from the bonds of carnal love. For the same reasons, it is only with caution that his poems may be used to understand how his ideas developed. Thus, a great deal of importance should not perhaps be read into his statement in the capitolo on friendship that modern times are corrupt, one of the most banal themes in Western literature.²

Accolti's poetry, although not very useful as an indication of the ideas he held as a young man, still reveals some of his interests during his formative years. He had begun the study of classical authors and had gained a familiarity with classical rhetoric, albeit on a limited scale. Moreover, he had an interest in popularizing classical literature and in demonstrating that the Italian language was capable of expressing philosophical ideas. The Certame Coronario, which provided Accolti with the occasion for his poem on friendship, was organized in order to vindicate the Volgare as a language worthy of serious consideration.³ The subject of all the entries was friendship and like several of the other contestants Accolti wrote a philosophical poem.⁴ Accolti was popularizing Cicero by translating his works into Italian, an aim shared by other Florentine humanists such as Matteo Palmieri, who had recently translated large parts of Cicero's De officiis and De amicitia into Italian in his Della vita civile. By treating of

1. Jacoboni, 'Le rime', p. 278.

2. Ibid. pp. 286, 294.

3. Cf. Flamini, La lirica toscana, pp. 8 seq.

4. Cf. ibid. pp. 19 seq. for a discussion of the poems. They have been published by A. Bonucci, in L. B. Alberti, Opere volgari, per la più parte inedite e tratte dagli autografi (Florence, 1843-9), vol. I, pp. clxvii seq.

serious subjects in his poems, he was perhaps endeavouring, along with Palmieri, Bruni and Alberti, to show that such matters could be expounded in the Volgare.

Accolti wrote no more poetry after 1450, a fact that is perhaps explained by the nature of his poems. Most of them are moral treatises in verse, and he must have found it awkward at best to adapt the contents of classical philosophy to the forms of Italian poetry. It is no wonder that he turned later to the form and language in which such ideas had been expressed in antiquity: the Latin dialogue.

From an early age Accolti was recognized as a man of letters. In 1436, when he was twenty-one, Poggio Bracciolini wrote to him: 'Your letters have delighted me; and I admire too your ability to write with eloquence, beauty and fluency. Eloquence is extremely difficult to acquire; indeed, in every period of history very few authors can with any justice be called eloquent. You have clearly made great strides in gaining a command of language, and I congratulate you for taking an interest in the study of the arts; for not only will your career be furthered, but you may also win distinction as a writer.'¹ Writing to a friend in 1440, Poggio again pointed out Accolti's proficiency as a writer.² At the same time, Accolti's poems were becoming known. Two manuscripts of them are known to have been copied in the 1440's, two more in the 1450's, and five others may be attributed to the middle of the fifteenth century.³

Accolti's poems were written at about the same time that Leonardo Bruni was defending the Volgare in his *Lives of Dante and Petrarch*, that Matteo Palmieri was translating Cicero and Quintilian in *Della vita civile*, and that Leon Battista Alberti was writing a series of treatises on ethics in Italian, the most famous of which is *Della famiglia*. The defence of the Volgare was a Florentine cause

1. *Epistolae*, ed. T. Tonelli (Florence, 1832-61), vol. II, pp. 97 seq.

2. *Ibid.* p. 230.

3. On the circulation of his poems, cf. Jacoboni, 'Le rime', pp. 241-2, 263, 265, 269, 277, 282, 285, 297.

and its champions, besides Alberti, were the humanists gathered around Bruni before his death in 1444.¹ Accolti's interests would seem to indicate that he was a member of this circle; moreover, it is known that he was a personal friend of Bruni's. During the summer of 1444, he received a letter from his friend, Girolamo Aliotti, the abbot of the Aretine monastery of Santa Fiora, who said he was sending him a copy of Poggio's funeral oration on the death of Bruni, in memory of Accolti's and Bruni's close friendship.² Another circle of humanists with whom Accolti was probably associated during the 1430's were the papal secretaries resident in Florence. One of them, Poggio, was almost a mentor to Accolti. Poggio's concern with Accolti's development as a humanist has already been pointed out, and Accolti was apparently indebted to Poggio for his efforts on his behalf.³

While Accolti was becoming more closely connected with the humanist movement, he continued to pursue his career as a lawyer. Although older humanists such as Carlo Marsuppini and Buonaccorso da Montemagno had been lawyers, Accolti's choice of profession still elicited surprise on the part of the humanists. Poggio, in a letter to Accolti in 1436, said he wondered how he had gained such a command of language, when the study of law must have taken up so much of his time. 'For it was an enormous task,' he wrote, 'to achieve an understanding of civil law: there were so many differing opinions and so much disagreement among lawyers; there were countless volumes of commentaries which entangled the reader in webs of contradiction. . . . Legal writings were lacking in all refinements of style. Modern

1. Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 332 seq.

2. Aliotti, Epistolae, vol. I, p. 91, where the letter is dated 18 July 1444. In Codex lat. 7, Cl. xiv, fol. 10v of the Biblioteca Marciana, in addition to other differences from the printed text, the letter is dated 10 August 1444.

3. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 100-1. Cf. ibid. p. 223, where Poggio calls Accolti 'imprimis amicissimus'.

lawyers appeared entirely ignorant of the eloquent works of their ancient predecessors. They were so deeply engrossed in refuting their colleagues' opinions, that they seem to have lost all interest in truth.' Law was nonsense, according to Poggio, because it was devoid of eloquence. In Poggio's opinion the aims of eloquence and law were poles apart. For the pursuit of eloquence was a civilizing influence, whereas the study of law could only lead to material enrichment. Lawyers were only interested in pecuniary gain, and their opinions were determined by their fees. Humanists of Bruni's circle agreed with Poggio that law, as it was currently studied, was nonsense.¹ Nevertheless, Poggio admitted it was impossible to live in society without money, and therefore advised Accolti to follow his legal career.²

Accolti came to the defence of his profession. In the second part of Poggio's Historia tripartita, he is given the part of arguing that the study of law was a more worthy pursuit than that of medicine. The upshot of the arguments attributed to him is that law is right reason, which comes from God and is eternal; on the other hand, medical knowledge is based on experience and is therefore subject to variation and contingency. The other side is argued by Niccolò da Foligno, a doctor of medicine, who maintains that laws vary from place to place and time to time, but that medicine, as a branch of natural philosophy, is eternally valid.³ Niccolò gets the better of Accolti in

1. Cf. Bruni's letter to Niccolò Strozzi, in La disputa delle arti nel Quattrocento, ed. E. Garin (Florence, 1947), p. 8; Lapo da Castiglione's letter to Roberto Strozzi, in Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pädagogik des Humanismus, ed. C. Müller, pp. 258-9; E. Garin, L'umanesimo italiano. Filosofia e vita civile nel Rinascimento (Bari, 1952), pp. 46 seq.

2. Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 97-100.

3. Published in Disputa, ed. Garin, pp. 15 seq. The debate on the superiority of medicine or law has been much discussed: cf. L. Thorndike, 'Medicine versus Law in Late Medieval and Medicean Florence', in Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century. Studies in the History of Medicine and Surgery, Natural and Mathematical Science, Philosophy and Politics (New York, 1929), pp. 24-58; Garin,

the argument, and the whole discussion is slanted by Poggio in order to show law off in a bad light. Accolti's arguments are based mainly on Cicero's De legibus and had been repeated in greater detail by Salutati in his treatise, De nobilitate legum et medicinae. Poggio may have been using the occasion simply to refute Salutati. What is significant, however, is that Niccolò's arguments were often used by humanists against lawyers;¹ in the dialogue, Accolti is defending his profession as much against the humanists as the physicians.

Accolti probably could not but feel that his professional activities and his interests as a humanist might be difficult to reconcile. Nevertheless, in the late 1430's and early 1440's, he carried on in his legal career. On 11 October 1435, even before he had received his doctorate, he was elected to read ius civile extraordinarium at the Florentine Studio for a year.² In 1437 he received his degree in civil law from Bologna, and during that year he seems to have lectured there at the university.³ The next year, 1438-9, he was again lecturing in Florence, with the same salary of twenty florins that he had previously received.⁴ During the year 1439-40, he was again a lecturer at the Florentine Studio,⁵ but he was apparently not altogether contented with his situation there; for

L'umanesimo, pp. 34-50; Walser, Poggius, pp. 249 seq.;-
Disputa, ed. Garin, passim; and C. Salutati, De nobilitate legum et medicinae. De verecundia, ed. E. Garin, (Florence, 1947).

1. Cf. Niccolò's argument that lawyers were venal with Poggio's letter to Accolti, pp. 55-6 above, and his argument that laws are everywhere different, with Bruni's letter to Niccolò Strozzi, p. 56, n. 1 above.

2. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 441-2; how long it was to last is clear from the other appointments cited.

3. A. Sorbelli, Storia della Università di Bologna (Bologna, 1944-7), vol. I, p. 242.

4. Cf. ASF, Monte Comune, 1285, fol. 90r; I am grateful to Prof. A. Molho for this reference.

5. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, p. 444.

in the spring of that year he was trying to obtain a position at the University of Siena. Poggio was then staying in Florence with the Curia, and Accolti had him write letters of recommendation to two of his Sienese friends. Accolti may have felt that his services were not adequately appreciated in Florence; for Poggio points out that often someone's merits were least appreciated at home, and that Accolti wished to lecture where he could enjoy the fruits of his labour, by which he meant not pecuniary recompense, but gloria et laus.¹ What Poggio said about Accolti's indifference to money should probably be taken with a grain of salt, since his salary was only twenty florins a year in the late 1430's. Another drawback was the dubious reputation enjoyed by the Florentine Studio;² Poggio wrote that Accolti wished to work in a distinguished university and that he considered the Sienese Studio particularly famous.³ One obstacle in the way of Accolti's advancement in Florence had perhaps been his age, for he was only twenty-five in 1440. Poggio realized that the same difficulty might stand in his way to an appointment in Siena and did not hesitate to allay any doubts on that score.⁴

Although Accolti may not have considered himself sufficiently well respected in Florence, some Florentines clearly had a high opinion of his legal abilities; Poggio for example called him a iuris consultus peritissimus and compared him with the lawyers of antiquity.⁵ It has been pointed out that Poggio had a low opinion of the legal profession; some of the concern he showed for Accolti's advancement as a lawyer doubtless derived from his interest

1. Epistolae, vol. II, p. 221.

2. Cf. G. Brucker, 'Florence and its University, 1348-1434', in Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe. Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison, ed. T. K. Rabb and J. E. Seigel (Princeton, 1969), pp. 220 seq.

3. Epistolae, vol. II, p. 221.

4. Ibid. p. 222. Cf. ibid. pp. 229-30 for Poggio's other letter to Berto on Accolti's behalf.

5. Ibid. p. 221.

in Accolti's development as a humanist. In his letter of recommendation to his Sienese friend, Bartolomeo de la Gazaja, he writes, 'Benedetto of Arezzo is an extremely skilled lawyer, and he has also taken an interest and gained proficiency in the studia humanitatis. . . . In my opinion, he is second to none, not only for his knowledge of law but also for his command of language. I beseech you, . . . for the sake of the studia humanitatis' to give him your support.¹

Accolti did not get the job at Siena.² Soon afterwards, early in 1441, his father died.³ He had been eager for Benedetto to become a lawyer, and he must have been a mainstay to him during the early years of his career. Just before he died, Messer Michele was able to sponsor Benedetto's entry on 4 April 1440 into the Florentine guild of lawyers and notaries, of which he had himself been a member.⁴ On that day, Messer Giovanni di Girolamo da Gubbio, who had been Michele's colleague in the Florentine Studio,⁵ acted as witness for Benedetto's matriculation.⁶ Before that time, because he had been under twenty-five, he had been ineligible for membership,⁷ and consequently unable to practise law in Florence, a disability which may have been one of the sources of his discontent in Florence before 1440. For several years after his matriculation, he showed no more signs of wishing to leave Florence. His

1. Ibid. pp. 230-1.

2. He was lecturing in 1441 in Florence; cf. p. 60 below.

3. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 5v; ASA, Estrazioni, IX, fol. 146r, 149v: Michele had been seriously ill during the 1430's: cf. ibid. VIII, fol. 159v, 162r-163r; ibid. IX, fol. 51v.

4. For Michele's membership, cf. p. 31 above.

5. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 438-40.

6. The act of matriculation is found in ASF, Arte di Giudici e Notai, 126, fol. 45r-45v.

7. Cf. Martines, Lawyers, p. 32.

service in the Studio is documented for the years 1440-1,¹ 1441-2;² 1444-5,³ and 1445-6,⁴ and it is probable that he was employed there in the intervening years. By 1442 his salary had been increased to 60 florins a year,⁵ and at the same time he is known to have begun practising law.⁶

The years 1440 to 1445 form a new phase in Accolti's life marked by greater success in his career. He became more content with life in Florence, and in 1447 he took a Florentine wife, Laura, the eighteen-year-old daughter of Messer Carlo di Francesco Federighi, a prominent Florentine lawyer and statesman.⁷ The marriage was an important step for Accolti, as the Federighi were a well-established Florentine family enjoying a high position in the city's social and political life. They first gained prominence in the middle of the fourteenth century, and from that time members of their family continually held the highest political offices.⁸ They made marriages with leading Florentine families such as the Rucellai, Bartolini and Panciatichi,⁹ and one member of the family, Messer Benozzo di Francesco, Laura's uncle, was Bishop of Fiesole from 1421 until his death in 1450.¹⁰ Laura's grandfather, Francesco di Lapo, was one of the prominent members of the

1. ASA, Estrazioni, IX, fol. 144r.

2. ASF, Monte Comune, 2364, fol. 101v; I am grateful to Prof. A. Molho for this reference.

3. ASA, Estrazioni, X, fol. 20r-20v.

4. Ibid. fol. 26v.

5. ASF, Monte Comune, 2364, fol. 101v.

6. ASF, Diplomatico, Famiglia Baldovinetti, 3 ottobre 1446.

7. ASF, Manoscritti, 348, fol. 13v; BNF, Pol. Gar., 1735.

8. ASF, Manoscritti, 250, fol. 700r-700v; ibid. 266, fol. 37v-38r; BNF, Carte Passerini, 8, fol. 95r; ibid. 187, fol. 25, 26, 27; ibid. 187, fasc. 51, fol. 1v-4v.

9. Ibid. 8, fol. 95r; ibid. 187, fol. 25, 26, 27.

10. Ibid. 187, fasc. 51, fol. 4r-4v.

regime before his death in 1411; he was twice Gonfaloniere of Justice, four times a member of the Dieci di Balìa, and often a representative of the Commune on important diplomatic missions.¹ Laura's father, Messer Carlo, was a lawyer and an eminent statesman; he was Gonfaloniere of Justice in 1444, three times a Prior, seven times a member of one of the Colleges, and a frequent speaker in the Pratiche.² His most important capacity in government was an ambassador, and as such he went to Popes Martin V and Eugenius IV, Emperor Albert, and the Sultan of Egypt.³ Accolti could certainly hope for support in his career from a family of high rank such as the Federighi; his marriage to Laura was clearly a good match for him.

Accolti's father-in-law, Messer Carlo, had been a colleague of Accolti's father in the Studio.⁴ He was not a rich man: his assets of about 1700 florins, which consisted of land holdings and Monte shares, were nearly always exceeded by his liabilities.⁵ He was not able to provide a large dowry of 1000 florins such as those given by many other leading Florentine families; he had arranged for Laura to have a dowry of 500 florins in the Monte delle Doti which was due to mature on 27 June 1448.⁶ In the person of Benedetto Accolti, Messer Carlo must have found a son-in-law well-suited to his particular situation. The Accolti were an old and respected Aretine family; at the time they may have been thought to have descended from an

1. Ibid. 8, fol. 95r; ibid. 187, fol. 25, 26, 27; ibid. 187, fasc. 51, fol. 2r.

2. ASF, Manoscritti, 250, fol. 700r; ibid. 266, fol. 37v-38r; on his appearances in the Pratiche, cf. D. V. Kent, Political Alignments in Florence on the Eve of Cosimo de' Medici's Rise to Power. 1427-1434, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1971, p. 267.

3. BNF, Carte Passerini, 187, fasc. 51, fol. 2v-3r.

4. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 438-40.

5. ASF, Catasto, 42, fol. 446r-447r; ibid. 76, fol. 65r-65v; ibid. 365, fol. 366r-366v; ibid. 405, fol. 199v-200r; ibid. 460, fol. 280v-281v; ibid. 671, fol. 376r-379v.

6. ASF, Monte delle doti, 1, fol. 94v, 151r.

an old but now extinct Florentine family also called Accolti.¹ But they had no real status in Florence, and could not expect to be regarded in the same light as the leading Florentine families. Being Aretines they were accustomed to more moderate dowries,² and would hardly have disapproved of Laura's dowry, the more so as Messer Michele's estate was only equal in value to Messer Carlo's fortune,³ and Benedetto could not feel that he had made a financial sacrifice by his marriage.

Accolti's marriage marked the high point of the period in which he was establishing his residence in Florence. During the later 1440's and early 1450's he continued to regard Florence as his home. He lived in the Parish of Santa Margherita at the Por' San Piero, at the intersection of the present Via del Proconsolo and Via del Corso, very near to the parish of Sant'Appolinare where his father had lived.⁴ He continued to lecture in the Studio.⁵ In 1448 he submitted a petition to the Florentine government which demonstrates the extent to which he had made Florence his home. For a considerable time, he stated, he had lived in Florence and lectured in the Studio. He intended to establish residence there and had taken a Florentine wife. Now as a sign that he was beginning to be naturalized as a Florentine citizen and as a token of his goodwill ('quod in signum initii sue civilitatis, et spei et affectionis

1. Cf. p. 11 above.

2. Cf. p. 26 above.

3. Cf. p. 24 above.

4. Cf. pp. 36-7 above for Michele's residence. In 1446 Accolti's house was said to be in the parish of the Badia Fiorentina (ASF, Diplomatico, Famiglia Baldovinetti, 3 ottobre 1446); in 1455 and 1457 it was said to be in the parish of Santa Margherita (ASF, Not. antecos., L 189 (1451-66), fol. 111r, 142r); and in 1469 his heirs were said to be living at Por' San Piero in the parish of Santa Margherita (ASF, Catasto, 929, fol. 610v). Since the Badia is just a few hundred yards away from Por' San Piero, it seems probable that Accolti always lived at Por' San Piero in Florence.

5. 1448: cf. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, pp. 455-6; 1451: cf. ibid. pp. 461-2.

quam habet fomentum') he wished to become eligible for two legal offices in the government, those of Savio del Comune and of Assessore dei Sindici dei Rettori Forensi. His petition was granted on the first reading.¹ By 1448, therefore, Accolti had declared his intention of becoming a Florentine citizen. At the same time, he was breaking his ties with Arezzo. Although his name after 1440 was often drawn as a communal official in Arezzo, he was disqualified on each occasion from filling the office because he was not living in Arezzo.²

Accolti may have begun to consider himself a Florentine, but he was still widely regarded as an Aretine. In 1444 Girolamo Aliotti wrote to him that one reason he was sending him Poggio's funeral oration on Bruni's death was that in it their native city, Arezzo, had been praised and examples from Aretine history had been cited illustrating its nobility. 'Therefore I chose you, Benedetto,' he continued, 'as the recipient of the oration. As you are considered a patron (patronus) and one of the first citizens (primarius) of our city, you might thank Poggio on behalf of all Arezzo.'³ In October 1449 he again wrote to Accolti stressing his ties with Arezzo. 'You have done so much for your native city,' he wrote, 'that I think not only its citizens are in your debt, but even its stones and walls.'⁴ The Aretine Commune considered him a citizen, as he was made eligible for communal offices; although he assumed none of the offices for which his name had been drawn, he occasionally acted as a temporary official, such as the supervisor of the imborsazioni of notaries of the catasto,⁵ and on two occasions he stood surety for other Aretine officials.⁶ Moreover, a letter of Aliotti's from

1. Published ibid. pp. 455-6; cf. also ASF, Libri Fabarum, 61, fol. 113r-113v.

2. ASA, Estrazioni, IX, fol. 113v, 117r-117v, 144r-144v; 190v, 191v; ibid. X, fol. 20r-20v, 26v, 57r.

3. Aliotti, Epistolae, vol. I, p. 91.

4. Ibid. p. 261.

5. ASA, Estrazioni, IX, fol. 53v.

6. Ibid. fol. 79r; ibid. X, fol. 22v.

1449 shows that he took an active part in the affairs of Arezzo's lay confraternity, the *Fraternità di Santa Maria della Misericordia*.¹ At the same time, he undertook commissions for Aretines, as for example on 4 April 1442, when he was appointed a procurator by Martino di Bernardo Grifoni of Arezzo to pay a debt to a Perugian lawyer.²

Accolti could not turn his back on Arezzo, if only because he was Messer Michele's eldest living son. After his father's death he became head of the family and had to undertake such responsibilities as the marriage of his sisters. In 1445 he arranged for his sister Tomasa to marry Messer Francesco di Lippo Lippi.³ The marriage was a professional alliance, for both Francesco and his brother Bernardo were lawyers.⁴ Their father was an Aretine retail cloth merchant (*ritagliatore*) and one of the richest men in Arezzo.⁵ From the marriages made by Lippo Lippi's children into such prominent families as the Bacci⁶ and Paganelli,⁷ it is clear that the family enjoyed a high rank in Arezzo. Tomasa's dowry was 450 florins,⁸ and was large for an Aretine dowry in the early fifteenth century.⁹ It was perhaps more than the amount that Messer Michele had intended to provide, for he had given only 300 florins to

1. *Epistolae*, vol. I, pp. 260-1.

2. ASF, Not. antecos., P 290 (1441-46), not foliated.

3. *Ibid.* 19 November 1445.

4. *Ibid.* P 289 (1437-1455), no. 127, Testament of Lippo fu di ser Niccolò di ser Lippo Ritagliatore, 28 April 1452.

5. Cf. Appendix I, Table I.

6. ASF, Not. antecos., P 289 (1437-55), no. 127; on the Bacci, cf. p. 27 above.

7. ASF, Not. antecos. P 289 (1437-55), no. 127; on the Paganelli, cf. Bartolomeo di Ser Gorello, *Cronica*, p. 16.

8. ASF, Not. antecos., P 290 (1441-1446), 19 November 1445.

9. Cf. p. 26 above.

his daughter Agnesa in 1427.¹ 200 florins of Tomasa's dowry consisted of the farm at Milisciano in the Cortine of Arezzo and the vineyards at San Giovanni in the Contado of Arezzo, which Benedetto and his brothers had inherited from their father.² In 1450, Benedetto arranged the marriage of his other sister Nanna to Bartolomeo di Nanni Taviani of Arezzo.³ The Taviani, or Ottaviani, as they were later called, were an old Aretine family, but seem not to have been as prominent as the Lippi.⁴ At first the amount of the dowry could not be agreed upon, so that the parties had to appoint the Bishop of Arezzo, Roberto degli Asini, as arbiter;⁵ but finally they settled on the sum of 300 florins.⁶ Accolti was also bound to his family by his father's estate, which was left undivided to the four surviving brothers, Benedetto, Francesco, Donato, and Giovanni. The property was almost exactly the same as in 1427 and was all located in Arezzo, the Aretine contado and in the Casentino. When the brothers submitted their report for the Aretine catasto of 1454, they had neither added to nor taken away from their inheritance, with the exception of the properties given in dowry to their sister Tomasa.⁷

The extent to which Accolti was able to settle in Florence by the early 1450's can be exaggerated. The provvisione of 1448 gave him only the rights to two particular offices related to his profession. Accolti's correspondence with Poggio in the spring of 1447 makes it clear that he did not consider himself irrevocably settled in Florence. At the beginning of Nicholas V's pontificate

1. Cf. p. 38 above.

2. ASF, Not. antecos. P 292 (1459), 5 July 1459.

3. Ibid. P 289 (1437-1455), no. 90, 6 April 1450.

4. Cf. Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo nel medio evo, ed. U. Pasqui, (Florence, 1899-1937), vol. II, pp. 236, 319.

5. ASF, Not. antecos., P 289 (1437-55), no. 90.

6. Ibid. no. 110, 4 November, 1450.

7. Cf. ASF, Catasto, 201, fol. 351r-358v with ASA, Catasto, 13, Porta Foro, fol. 212v-221r.

After 1453, Accolti became more closely tied to Florence. He worked on legal matters for Florentine citizens,¹ for the Florentine Archbishop,² and for the Florentine Commune.³ In November 1456 he held his first public office in Florence when he was elected assessor of the Sindici del Podestà, whose duty was to examine the conduct of the Podestà during his term of office.⁴ At the same time he broke some of the remaining ties with his family in Arezzo. On 25 April 1456 he divided his property with his brothers Francesco and Donato. Benedetto received all the property at Bagnena, and his brothers received in common the property at Poggibaldi and Salutio. All three continued to own jointly their house and garden in Arezzo.⁵ Moreover, by the 1450's Accolti had formed a circle of Florentine friends the closest of whom was Messer Otto Niccolini, a lawyer and prominent Florentine statesman. Accolti and Messer Otto worked together in the Studio⁶ and on private cases,⁷ which suggests that their friendship originated as a professional acquaintance. They came to share intellectual interests. They both encouraged Marsilio Ficino in his early career and studies⁸ and together with Piero de' Pazzi they were associated with the humanist circle centred on Giovanni Argyrypoulos after he came to Florence in

1. ASF, Not. antecos., L 189 (1451-66), fol. 142r-142v.

2. ASF, Not. antecos., D 86 (1446-54), fol. 92v-93v; ibid. (1449-55) fol. 146v; ibid. D 87 (1458-62), fol. 12v, 15v-16r. I am grateful to Mr C. Fuller for these references.

3. Cf. Martines, Lawyers, p. 169.

4. ASF, Tratte, 81, fol. 57r.

5. ASF, Not. antecos., S 1190 (not foliated), 25 April 1456.

6. Cf. Statuti, ed. Gherardi, p. 462.

7. Cf. BNF, Panciat. 139, fol. 138v, 139v; ibid. Magl. XXIX, 73, fol. 220v, 222r.

8. A. Della Torre, Storia dell'Accademia Platonica di Firenze (Florence, 1902), pp. 545 seq.; R. Marcel, Marcel Ficin (Paris, 1958), pp. 216-7, 258-63, 690-3, 731.

1457.¹ The Accolti and Niccolini families eventually became connected by marriage.²

By the mid-1450's Accolti seemed well-settled in Florence. He had a house at Por' San Piero, in which he had lived for some time and was to continue living until his death. He had held public office in Florence, was an almost permanent member of staff at the Studio, had a prospering legal practice, and had formed a circle of Florentine friends. But he was still not completely averse to the idea of moving. In 1456 he entered into negotiations with the Sienese Studio for an appointment to a lectureship in law, which he said he would not accept for a salary of less than 500 florins a year.³ In the end the negotiations came to nothing; but they show clearly where Accolti stood in the later 1450's. His position as a lawyer had greatly improved since the time in which he had earned only twenty florins a year; and he was no longer prepared to leave Florence unless an extremely favourable appointment turned up elsewhere.

1. Cf. Vespasiano da Bisticci, Vite di uomini illustri, ed. L. Frati (Bologna, 1892-3), vol. III, pp. 67-8; Della Torre, Storia, pp. 391-2.

2. Cf. G. Niccolini di Camugliano, The Chronicles of a Florentine Family (London, 1933), pp. 138-9.

3. ASF, Not. antecos., L 189 (1451-66), fol. 125r.

CHAPTER III: ACCOLTI'S CAREER AS CHANCELLOR OF FLORENCE

On 27 October 1456 a number of Florentines were asked to give advice on the reelection of the chancellor, Messer Poggio Bracciolini. 'Apparently Messer Poggio has not been reelected,' said Messer Alessandro degli Alessandri and Luca Pitti, speaking for all the members of the Pratica. 'We think . . . Messer Poggio should again be selected. He is the best man for the job, because of his learning, practical experience and fame.'¹ A month later on 27 November, the question had not yet been resolved and at that time some complaints about the chancellery were raised. 'The chancellery is in such a state of confusion that the interest and reputation of the city as a whole are suffering,' said Messer Alessandro degli Alessandri, speaking for the Pratica. 'Clearly a reform of this office must be undertaken, but I do not know along what lines.' He added that the old chancellor had been asked

1. ASF, CP, 54, fol. 49v-50r:

Dominus Alexander
Luca Pitti

. . .

Che inteso non avere avuto la riforma Messer Poggio, siamo di parere tutti noi della pratica et anchora di quelli che non ci sono per essere impediti, che in quello luogo si debbi ricondurre Messer Poggio predetto, perchè niuno altro può esser meglio in quello luogo, ne meglio può esser riformata la cancelleria che della persona sua, si per la scientia et per la pratica et per la experientia et per la fama sua grande. Et questa ricondotta si intenda et examinisi bene con li collegi et in modo che quella si obtengha, si per honore della Signoria, si anchora dela persona di Messer Poggio.

. . .

Dominus Alexander de Alexandris
Dominus Mannus Tenperani
Dominus Carolus de Pandolfinis
Dominus Octo de Nicholinis
Dominus Jeronimus de Machiavellis

Dominus Thomasus Deti
Lucas de Pittis
Dietisalvi Neronis
Julianus Porticini

This passage was omitted by Walser in his edition of these debates in Poggius Florentinus, pp. 404-6.

to come to Florence from Rome and reaffirmed that he was 'an extremely learned man, who has brought our city great distinction.' On 8 December the chancellery was again discussed in the Pratica and Messer Alessandro repeated what he had said on 27 November. Messer Carlo Pandolfini agreed that the chancellery was in disorder, again mentioning that the chancellor was old. 'The chancellor,' he continued, 'must be reelected. And if that is impossible, another famous man should be found.' The other speakers agreed that Poggio was learned and famous, and that he should remain chancellor; Otto Niccolini suggested that young men should be found to help in the chancellery and Bernardo Gherardi proposed that four citizens should look into the reform of the office. Both these recommendations were followed. Otto Niccolini, Dietisalvi Neroni, Matteo Palmieri and Franco Sachetti, who were chosen to outline such a reform, reported on 27 December that the chancellery was not functioning properly, especially because there had not been a new chancellor for some time and because more help was needed. But it was desirable, they continued, to have a famous and respected chancellor, who would bring distinction to the city and provide an example for anyone else who in the future might be called from abroad. Poggio, therefore, should remain first chancellor and Ser Antonio di Mariano should be elected second chancellor (whose office had been held by the first chancellor since 1444). Four coadjutors should be found to help the chancellor and, to assist in paying their salaries, two of them should lecture in the Studio. The chancellor, as the servant of the Signoria, should not hold any other communal office.¹

In his commentary on the life of Poggio, Vespasiano da Bisticci too mentioned Poggio's fame at the time he was chancellor. 'Messer Poggio was highly thought of in Rome and enjoyed the highest favour of the pope,' he said. 'He was elected /chancellor of the Signoria/ and his

1. Ibid.

election was very popular.¹ Although the pope was satisfied with Poggio's work, continued Vespasiano, mentioning like Alessandro Alessandri Poggio's practical experience, some contentious people began to calumniate him. They thought that with the help of Cosimo de' Medici they could have Poggio removed from office and another man put in his place. As he was already old, continued Vespasiano, touching on another theme of the Pratica, Poggio was willing to give up his office in order to have more time for his studies. Cosimo did not want Poggio to go, but seeing that Poggio offered no opposition, he did not protest.² Vespasiano was clearly referring to the discontent with the state of the chancellery which led to the discussions in the Pratiche at the end of 1456.

Poggio was unhappy in Florence. Before leaving the Curia Pope Nicholas V had told him that he would be disillusioned before a year was out,³ and it was just a year after his arrival that he began to show signs of discontent.⁴ On 15 July 1454, suffering from gout and unable to work, he wrote to the pope that he consoled himself on having avoided the summer's heat in Florence and the many tedious official meetings.⁵ By 1455 he was suggesting that he might return to Rome⁶ and in that year he began spending less and less time in the chancellery. There were periods of several months during which he wrote no letters for the Signoria,⁷

1. Vite, ed. Greco, vol. I, p. 547. Poggio himself wrote that on arrival in Florence he had been well received (Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 54-5). Cf. Walser, Poggius, p. 282.

2. Vite, ed. Greco, p. 548.

3. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 63. Cf. Walser, Poggius, p. 282.

4. Poggio was elected chancellor on 27 April 1453; he took office on 8 June 1453. Cf. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 220-1.

5. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 56-7.

6. Cf. ibid. pp. 216-7 (dated 1455 by R. Fubini, in Poggio, Opera omnia / Turin, 1964-9, vol. IV, p. 739).

7. Walser, Poggius, p. 286.

and on one occasion it was necessary to have him dragged forcibly to the palace.¹ It is related in a fifteenth-century anecdote that during an important meeting of the Dieci di Balìa Poggio, growing restless and hearing the clock strike nine, cried out, 'Cazzo in culo a questo popolo: odi nona! io voglio ire a desinare.'² The state of the records of the Pratiche reflect how little Poggio was interested in his job.³ The chancellor was responsible for drawing up the minutes of the meetings and while Carlo Marsuppini, Poggio's predecessor, was in office, they had been recopied into the registers in neat, cursive script.⁴ After 1453, however, they were usually written in the registers in a hurried and careless hand, probably during the meetings themselves. Clearly Poggio's lack of interest and negligence lay beneath the complaints raised in the Pratiche of 1456. By 1457 he was at the point of seeking a position at the Curia. He began writing to cardinals about his hopes of returning to Rome,⁵ but no one but his close friend Cardinal Capranica gave him any encouragement.⁶ In 1457, despite the exemption from taxation he had enjoyed since 1434 in Florence,⁷ he was obliged to pay an extraordinary tax, or balzello, of 200 florins.⁸ Enraged, he wrote an Invectiva contra fidei violatores, denouncing the bad faith of the Florentines;⁹ it was pro-

1. Ibid. pp. 396-7.

2. Ibid. pp. 285-6.

3. ASF, CP, 53, 54, passim.

4. ASF, CP, 52, passim.

5. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 260 seq.; cf. Walser, Poggius, pp. 287-8.

6. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 270, 273-4; cf. Walser, Poggius, p. 296.

7. Ibid. pp. 349-351.

8. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 257-8, dated 1457 by Fubini, in Opera omnia, vol. II, p. 889 and vol. IV, p. 704. Vespasiano says the balzello was levied after Poggio left the palace. (Vite, ed. Greco, pp. 548-9) Cf. Walser, Poggius, pp. 290-1.

9. -Published in Opera omnia, ed. Fubini, vol. II, pp. 886-902.

bably not published during his lifetime¹ and clearly was never widely known, since it is extant in only one manuscript.² But just as Vespasiano had written, Poggio did not long remain chancellor after complaints about him had been raised: the last entry in the register of his missive was dated 16 April 1458,³ and on the next day, 17 April, his successor was elected: Benedetto Accolti.⁴

Poggio had encouraged Accolti in his studies and had recommended him for appointment as a lecturer in law at Siena;⁵ it has even been suggested that he resigned as chancellor in favour of Accolti.⁶ Whether he was Poggio's chosen successor is a matter for speculation, but it was undoubtably hoped in Florence that he would be a fitting replacement for Poggio. Little more than a year before all the speakers in the Pratiche concerning the reform of the chancellery had spoken of Poggio's fame, and it was expressly for that reason that they had recommended he be re-elected first chancellor. He was indeed one of the leading Italian humanists, and on that score Accolti could hardly have been considered his equal. But Accolti had achieved something of a literary reputation. His Italian poetry was reasonably well known in the mid-fifteenth century. He had an extensive circle of humanist friends. 'There were few learned men in Florence,' wrote Vespasiano da Bisticci, 'whom Messer Benedetto did not know.'⁷ He is known to have corresponded with Poggio, Ficino and Geronimo Aliotti.⁸

1. Cf. Walser, Poggius, p. 291.

2. Cf. Opera omnia, ed. Fubini, vol. II, p. 889. It is not mentioned by Vespasiano in the list of works written by Poggio appended to his Commentary.

3. ASF, Missive, 54, fol. 203v.

4. ASF, Balie, 29, fol. 60r.

5. Cf. p. 58 above.

6. G. Shepherd-T. Tonelli, Vita di Poggio Bracciolini, vol. II (Florence, 1825), pp. 167-8.

7. Vite, ed. Greco, p. 597.

8. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 97-101, 340-1; Aliotti, Epistolae, vol. I, pp. 91, 260-1; M. Ficino, Opera omnia (Turin, 1962), vol. I, pp. 611-2.

His eloquence was frequently mentioned. 'He had a knowledge of the studia humanitatis,' wrote Vespasiano, 'and he wrote well in Latin prose and verse; he composed graceful vernacular poetry and had a full knowledge not only of the studia humanitatis, but of sacred works and of history. . . . Messer Benedetto deserves the highest praise: members of his profession are usually oblivious to all refinements of language, but he acquired a graceful writing style by his own determination.'¹

As a lawyer too he had achieved a considerable reputation. 'Whenever Messer Benedetto was engaged in a case involving the interpretation of civil and canon law,' wrote Vespasiano, 'all others bowed to his authority.'² The salary he received in Florence during the 1440's and 1450's is unknown, but some indication of it may be ascertained from the negotiations in which he was occasionally involved with the University of Siena. In October 1451 he was elected to lecture there for a salary of 300 florins, but apparently he did not take up the post, since in that year he was listed as one of the lecturers at the Florentine Studio.³ In 1456 he was again involved in negotiations with Siena, when he instructed his agents not to accept any appointment for less than 500 florins a year, but once more it seems to have come to nothing.⁴ The salaries proposed would have been high at the Florentine Studio, where lecturers in law were usually paid between 100 and 300 florins a year.⁵ At the University of Florence, moreover, lecturers were ordinarily engaged for no more than two or three years' service; it may have been an indication of the

1. Vite, pp. 596, 598.

2. Ibid. p. 597.

3. C. Corso, 'Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo lettore di diritto nello studio di Siena,' Buletino senese di storia patria, 3a serie, XIV-XV (1955-6), pp. 26-7.

4. ASF, Notarile antecos., L 189 (1451-66), fol. 125r.

5. G. Brucker, 'Florence and its University, 1348-1434,' in Action and Conviction, p. 231.

favour and reputation Accolti enjoyed that he remained there for more than twenty years.¹ 'He lectured in Florence and had the widest following there,' wrote Vespasiano, 'and he achieved an extensive reputation throughout Italy, as he had many students from various places. He was not only an accomplished lecturer, but an able practising lawyer; many non-Florentines came to him for legal advice.'² A number of manuscripts of his consilia are extant,³ and there is other evidence to suggest that he had an extensive legal practice in Florence.⁴ 'With his renown growing each day among scholars and laymen, Messer Benedetto was elected chancellor': in attributing Accolti's election to his reputation, Vespasiano was probably not mistaken.

One of the speakers in the Pratiche of 1456 had mentioned Poggio's practical knowledge and it is true that he was a notary and had spent many years writing letters as a papal secretary. Many former chancellors, as notaries, had been experienced in drawing up public documents and had served as chancellors or in the chancelleries of other government offices or other communes. Coluccio Salutati was a notary and had been chancellor of Lucca;⁵ Ser Benedetto Fortini had worked with Salutati in the Florentine chancellery and for many years had been chancellor of the Dieci di Balìa;⁶ Ser Pietro di Mino had been chancellor of the Parte Guelfa;⁷ and Ser Paolo Fortini had been a

1. Ibid. p. 232.

2. Vite, pp. 595-6.

3. Some manuscripts containing his consilia are:
 ASF, Carte Stroziane, serie III, no. 41.
 BNF, Magl. (Stroziano), XXIX, 173, fol. 219r seq., 377 seq.
 BNF, Magl. (Stroziano), XXIX, 193, fol. 169r seq.
 BNF, Panciat., 139, fol. 140r seq.
 Forlì, Biblioteca Comunale, Autografi Piancastelli, no. 12.
 Biblioteca Vaticana, Vaticano Latino, 8067.
 Biblioteca Vaticana, Ottoboniano Latino, 1726.
 Biblioteca Vaticana, Urbinate Latino, 1132.

4. Cf. above p. 67.

5. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 115.

6. Ibid. pp. 154-5.

7. Ibid. p. 157.

coadjutor of Ser Benedetto Fortini as chancellor and had himself been chancellor of the Dieci di Balìa.¹ Leonardo Bruni was the first chancellor who was not a notary, but as a former papal secretary he was experienced in writing official letters.² At least once before he was elected, Accolti too had worked in the chancellery. After August 1456 Poggio wrote very few letters,³ and his place was presumably taken by his coadjutors. On 16 February 1457, however, a Pratica advised that the instructions for the ambassador about to leave for Rome, Maestro Guglielmo de' Benci, should be drafted not by the coadjutors but by Messer Otto Niccolini and Messer Benedetto Accolti.⁴ Accolti, nevertheless, could not have been very experienced in writing public letters before becoming chancellor, and there had been indications previously that the importance of learning and reputation now outweighed that of notarial experience in electing a chancellor. Carlo Marsuppini had had no practical experience in writing official letters, as his only other public appointment had been as Professor of Greek at the Florentine Studio.⁵ Bruni too when he was elected chancellor for a second time in 1427 had greater renown as a humanist than as a papal secretary. And in the Pratiche of 1456 Poggio was more often praised for his learning and fame than for his practical knowledge.

What undoubtedly continued to matter was the chancellor's Latin style. Leonardo Bruni was regarded by his contemporaries as one of the most eloquent men of his age and as one of the restorers of the Latin language;⁶ for

1. Ibid. p. 160.

2. Ibid. p. 189.

3. Walser, Poggius, p. 286.

4. ASF, CP, 54, fol. 90v: 'die xvi februarii 1456. . . super commissione danda Magistro Giuglielmo de Benchis ituro oratori ad papam, Dominus Octo e Dominus Benedictus illam componant.'

5. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 212.

6. Cf. G. Manetti, 'Oratio funebris in solenni Leonardi . . . Poetae Laureatione,' in Bruni, Epistolae, ed. L. Mehus (Florence, 1741), vol. 1, pp. xciii-xciv, xcvi-xcvii,

the most part he wrote in up-to-date humanist Latin. In both his public and private works he substituted classical for medieval Latin words, such as bellum for guerra,¹ and he did not use medieval constructions, such as quod in place of ut, such as Salutati had done.² But he still preferred nichil and michi to nihil and mihi, and in public letters he used the contemporary plural to address persons of importance such as the Emperor.³ Carlo Marsuppini, although never so famous as Bruni, was still considered a man of eloquence;⁴ in some respects he wrote more rigorously classical Latin than Bruni, substituting nihil, for example, for nichil.⁵ Poggio admired only the classical languages, deprecating the Volgare,⁶ and was more fastidious in imitating classical Latin than Bruni. The

c-cv, cx, cxii-cxiv; P. Bracciolini, 'Oratio funebris in obitu Leonardi Arretini,' ibid. pp. cxx, cxxiv; 'Laudatio Leonardi historici et oratoris', ed. E. Santini in 'Leonardo Bruni Aretino e i suoi "Historiarum florentini populi libri XII." Contribuito allo studio della storia umanista', Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Filosofia e filologia, XXII (1910), pp. 151-4; Vespasiano, Vite, p. 464; B. Fazio, De viris illustribus, ed. L. Mehus (Florence, 1745), pp. 9-10; 'Vita di Leonardo Aretino' by G. Mancini, in Bruni, Historiarum Florentini populi libri XII (Florence, 1855-60), vol. I, pp. 21-8.

1. Bruni, Historiae florentini populi, ed. Santini, pp. 3, 5, 6, etc.

2. Ibid. pp. 3, 4, 5 etc.

3. Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 107-8. The missive from Bruni's administration show that he used nichil: cf. e.g. ASF, Missive, 33, fol. 80r: 'nichil aliud importet.' Cf. H. Baron, From Petrarch to Bruni. Studies in humanistic and political literature (Chicago, 1968), pp. 221-2. Examples of Bruni's use of the plural when writing to one person: ASF, Missive, 33, fol. 61v-63v, 73v-74r, 77r-79v, 79v-81r, 94r-97r.

4. Cf. Matteo Palmieri's oration on crowning Marsuppini poet laureate, in S. Salvini, Fasti consolari dell'Accademia Fiorentina (Florence, 1717), pp. 525-7; Lapo da Castiglionchio, Proemium to his translation of Plutarch's life of Themosticles, in F. P. Luiso, 'Studi sull'epistolario e le traduzioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio Juniore,' Studi italiani di filologia classica, VII (1899), p. 266.

5. Cf. for example, ASF, Missive, 36, fol. 102v: 'Nihil est gratius.'

6. That was implicit when he agreed with Biondo that the

narrative style of his Historia florentina, for example, is more closely modeled on Sallust and Livy than Bruni's,¹ and as early as 1406 he had said nihil was preferable to nichil.² Accolti's very first letters as chancellor show his command of humanist Latin style: he used nihil rather than nichil, always used quod and ut correctly, did not omit connectives between sentences, and substituted classical for medieval Latin words.³

Accolti, because of his eloquence, reputation and experience, was a suitable replacement for Poggio, but it was probably hoped that he would be an improvement too. Vespasiano, Carlo Pandolfini and Alessandro Alessandri had all spoken of Poggio's advanced age, and he was the oldest chancellor ever elected. Salutati had been 44;⁴ Paolo Fortini, 30;⁵ Bruni, 41;⁶ Marsuppini, 45;⁷ but Poggio had been 73 when he became chancellor.⁸ After Poggio the Florentines returned to the custom of electing younger chancellors: Accolti was 43 in 1458 and his successor Bartolomeo Scala was only 37 when elected in 1465.⁹ Poggio's advanced age was probably responsible for much of his lack of interest and eccentricity, and had made it difficult for

Vol. g. a re was a corruption of classical Latin: cf. Poggio, Opera (Basel, 1538), pp. 52 seq.

1. N. Rubinstein, 'Poggio Bracciolini cancelliere e storico di Firenze,' Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca di lettere, arti e scienze di Arezzo, new series, XXXVII (1958-64), pp. 226-8.

2. Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati, ed. F. Novati (Rome, 1891-1911), vol. IV, part 1, pp. 162-3. Examples of nihil in missive: ASF, Missive, 40, fol. 4r, 9r, 18r, etc.

3. Cf. ASF, Missive, 42, fol. 1r seq.

4. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 113, 117.

5. Ibid. p. 160.

6. Ibid. pp. 159, 188.

7. Ibid. pp. 211, 212.

8. Ibid. pp. 219-221.

9. Ibid. pp. 236, 239.

him to perform the ordinary duties of a chancellor. For that reason the Pratica of 1456 had recommended that four coadjutors and a second chancellor be elected to lighten his burden. Poggio was not the first chancellor for whom, in old age, it had been necessary to provide assistance. Except between 1375 and 1377 Salutati had been Notaro delle Tratte as well as chancellor, the offices virtually being joined after 1378;¹ in 1405, however, when he was 73, his son Bonifazio was elected Notaro delle Tratte in his place.² In 1437, moreover, a second chancellor was appointed to deal with correspondence within Florentine territory.³ That reform has been regarded as a stage in the development of a more highly specialized chancellery,⁴ but it should be remembered that Bruni was already 67 years old when a second chancellor was first elected. There were precedents for providing the chancellor with assistance in old age, but it was expensive to appoint additional coadjutors. Two of the coadjutors recommended by the Pratica of 1456, in fact, were to lecture in the Studio and were to be paid in part from money set aside for the Studio. It is not known whether these recommendations were carried out, and there was probably considerable relief when, in 1458, a younger man could be appointed. Accolti, indeed, was elected with provision for only one coadjutor.⁵

Poggio tended to be egotistic, tactless and argumentative: he was not the easiest of men to get on with, and was not very popular in Florence.⁶ On the other hand, Accolti's election as chancellor, according to Vespasiano, pleased everyone in Florence.⁷ It was considered impor-

1. Ibid. pp. 112, 117-8, 134.

2. Ibid. p. 148.

3. Ibid. pp. 196-7.

4. Ibid. p. 196.

5. ASF, Balie, 29, fol. 60r.

6. Cf. Vespasiano, Vite, pp. 547-8.

7. Ibid. p. 596.

tant for the chancellor to be popular and not a party to faction. Ser Niccolò Monachi, for example, was closely associated with the Ricci faction during the 1360's and 1370's,¹ and he was removed from office in 1375, condemned as a Ghibelline in 1378, and exiled from Florence for six years in 1382.² Ser Paolo Fortini was closely connected with Rinaldo degli Albizzi's party and he was dismissed in 1427.³ But when Fortini's successor, Leonardo Bruni, was appointed on 2 December 1427, Giuliano dei Medici was glad to point out to his father, Averardo, that his election was popular. 'Yesterday morning,' he wrote, 'Messer Leonardo d'Arezzo was elected chancellor. . . The Signoria and the Colleges made the election, and it still has to go before the Councils, but everyone is pleased with it.'⁴

The chancellor was sometimes required to give public orations, particularly when foreign dignitaries were being received, and he was expected not only to be able to recite a prepared speech, but to make a spontaneous reply to the ambassador's oration. When Frederick III was in Florence in 1453, for example, the Signoria visited him at

1. G. Brucker, Florentine Politics and Society. 1343- (Princeton, 1962), p. 207.

2. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 103-4.

3. Ibid. pp. 184-6.

4. ASF, MAP, filza II, no. 65:

Verso: Viro Averardo de me. . . (sic) oratori comunis Florentie Ferrarie etcetera

Recto: Al nome di dio e di iii di dicembre 1427 . . . Ieri mattina fu eletto Messer Lionardo d'Arezo cancielliere con fiorini 600 l'ano. E' a a tenere 2 chuitatori et Ser Filippo di Ser Ugolino alle tratte con 300 fiorini con 2 chuitatori. Anno lo fatto i signori e collegi. A anchora andare pe' consigli ma a ciaschumno piacie tale electione.

. . . Giuliano

The passage has been published inaccurately and only in part by Mancini, in Bruni, Historiae, vol. I, p. 32. It has also been published in part by Kent, Political Alignments, p. 299. I am grateful to Dr Kent for the reference.

Santa Maria Novella and, in their name, Carlo Marsuppini delivered a Latin oration. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini answered on behalf of the Emperor, asking some questions which called for an extempore reply. The Signoria turned to Marsuppini, but he was unwilling to speak without preparation. In their embarrassment they had to call on Giannozzo Manetti who extemporized a reply.¹ Clearly it was hoped that such an incident would not recur, and Benedetto Accolti, in fact, had two qualities which should have made him a good public speaker: a quick wit and a remarkable memory. 'Messer Benedetto,' wrote Vespasiano, 'surpassed all others of his day in the outstanding powers of his intellect and his amazing memory. . . He could discuss any topic because he committed everything he read to memory; whenever he found himself in learned company, his memory won him distinction.'² A sound memory is required in giving prepared speeches and a quick wit, in speaking off-hand. A good memory would have been useful for speaking without preparation, providing a rich store of topoi, exempla and quotations. As a lecturer in law, Accolti had also had the opportunity to speak in public for more than twenty years.

Accolti's election as chancellor must have been particularly good news for some Florentines, such as his wife's family, the Federighi. They had remained prominent in political life after the death of Messer Carlo di Francesco,³ and had probably used their influence in Accolti's favour. Other prominent Florentines, such as Tomaso Borromei, for whom Accolti had worked, may have taken an interest in his future.⁴ Accolti's close friend and pro-

1. Vespasiano, Vite, pp. 518-20.

2. Ibid. pp. 595-6.

3. Federigo di Jacopo Federighi, for example, was Gonfaloniere of Justice in 1452 (BNF, Fondo Passerini, 8, fol. 95r; ibid. 187, fol. 25, 26, 27); he was one of the arroti of the Balia (N. Rubinstein, The Government of Florence under the Medici 1434-94 / Oxford, 1966 /, p. 279); a member of the Otto di Guardia in 1458 (ibid. p. 282). Domenico di Jacopo Federighi was one of the arroti of the Balia of 1458 too (ibid. p. 289).

4. ASF, Not. antecos., L 189 (1451-66), fol. 142r.

fessional colleague, Messer Otto Niccolini, was one of the most powerful members of the regime and was likely to have exercised his influence on Accolti's behalf.¹

The Florentines came to regard Accolti as a suitable first chancellor, and it is probably no coincidence that at this time he began to look upon Florence as his permanent home. Sometime between October 1458 and February 1459 he became a Florentine citizen. In 1458 he still was subject to the Aretine Catasto² and on 7 October 1458 when his salary as chancellor was increased by the Balìa from 300 to 450 florins a year, he was only referred to as 'dominus Benedictus olim domini Michaelis de accoltis.'³ But on 20 February 1459 when he was reelected chancellor by the Consiglio del Cento he was called 'dominus Benedictus domini Michaelis de Accoltis de Aretio Civis florentinus,'⁴ and on 23 February 1461 when his salary was increased from 450 to 600 florins a year, he was again called 'dominus Benedictus domini michaelis de accoltis de aretio civis ac primus cancellarius florentinus.'⁵ It is not known exactly how Accolti became a Florentine citizen at that time, and there is no official record of the act. It should be noted that not all previous chancellors had been Florentine citizens when elected: Leonardo Bruni, although first elected chancellor in 1410, was not made a citizen until 1416,⁶ and Coluccio Salutati did not become a citizen until 1400.⁷

According to his Catasto in 1458, all of Accolti's

1. Cf. Rubinstein, Government, pp. 19, 24, 25-7, 76; L. Passerini, Genealogia e storia della famiglia Niccolini (Florence, 1870), pp. 37-40; Niccolini di Camugliano, Chronicles, pp. 193, 306, 307.

2. ASA, Catasto, 13 (1454), fol. 212v seq.

3. ASF, Balìa, 29, fol. 60r.

4. ASF, Consiglio del Cento, Registri, 1, fol. 15v.

5. ASF, Provvisioni, Registri, 151, fol. 367r. He also began to sign his consilia as a Florentine citizen: cf. BNF, Panciat., 139, fol. 139v.

6. Santini, 'Leonardo Bruni e i suoi', pp. 133-9.

7. Martines, Social World, pp. 148-9.

property was still located in the Aretino,¹ but after he became chancellor he began buying land just outside of Florence, near Fiesole. On 16 January 1462 Accolti designated Ser Giovanni Battista di Messer Guido di Arezzo as his procurator to purchase certain properties from the general of the Servite order.² These were a part of the podere which Accolti was reported to have bought in the parish of the Badia di Fiesole: the rest was purchased from Messer Girolamo Giugni, and Monna Antonia di Francesco di Sandro.³ In 1469 it was reported that the farm was worth 911 florins 13s. 5d. The rest of the property in the country owned by Accolti's heirs at that time was worth 442 florins 17s 2d⁴ so that the podere at Fiesole constituted the largest part of Accolti's estate.⁵

Accolti's wife's family, the Federighi, had been closely associated with Fiesole, and it may have been that connection which led Accolti to purchase land there. In 1427 Messer Carlo Federighi, Laura's father, owned a vineyard in the parish of San Pietro a Careggi at the foot of the hill of Fiesole.⁶ Sometime between 1433 and 1442 he acquired half of a house with a vineyard and a piece of land for growing cane attached in the parish of the Badia of Fiesole.⁷ Messer Carlo's brother, Benozzo, was also Bishop of Fiesole from 1421 to 1450, having previously been a canon of the cathedral there.⁸

1. ASA, Catasto, 13, fol. 212v, 218r-221r.

2. ASF, Not. antecos., L 189 (1451-66), fol. 226r.

3. ASF, Catasto, 929, fol. 610r.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid. 42, fol. 446r; he continued to own the property until his death in 1449: cf. ibid. 671, fol. 376v.

7. Ibid. 620, fol. 320r; he continued to own the property until his death: cf. ibid. 671, fol. 379r.

8. C. Eubel, Hierarchia catholica medii aevi (Monasterii, 1913), vol. I, p. 249; BNF, Fondo Passerini, 187, fasc. 51, fol. 4r.

After becoming chancellor, therefore, Accolti settled more permanently in Florence than his father had done. Unlike Messer Michele, he became a Florentine citizen, and most of his property was near Florence. Accolti, moreover, succeeded in establishing his family in Florentine society. Whereas each of Michele's children, except for Benedetto himself, married an Aretine, each of Benedetto's children married a member of a prominent Florentine family. It is true that Accolti died before any of his children were married; nevertheless, after Michele's death his daughter Tomasa married an Aretine, Messer Francesco di Ser Niccolò di Ser Lippo, and thus the ties to Arezzo, which during his lifetime he had never abandoned, were maintained. Similarly it may be assumed that the social position Benedetto had secured for his family enabled his children to contract favourable marriages in Florence after his death.

In 1469 Caterina, Benedetto's eldest daughter, married Bernardo di Paolo Altoviti.¹ The Altoviti were descended from a noble family from Fiesole who settled in Florence in the twelfth century,² and were prominent in Florentine political, commercial and military life from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries.³ Bernardo di Paolo's line of the Altoviti included several well-known public figures and soldiers, but by the fifteenth century it had become a lesser branch of the family, which only with difficulty maintained its importance in public life.⁴ Ber-

1. BCA, Codex 17, fol. 2r.

2. N. Ottokar, Il comune di Firenze alla fine del Duecento, 2nd ed. (Turin, 1962), p. 63; L. Passerini, Genealogia e storia della famiglia Altoviti (Florence, 1871), pp. 8, 17, 20.

3. Cf. ibid. pp. 17, 19, 20, 71, 143-6, 150-6; Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, vol. II, pp. 573-81; Ottokar, Il comune, p. 62; R. Davidsohn, Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz (Berlin, 1896-1908), pp. 159, 189; A. Saporì, Studi di storia economica (Florence, 1947-67), vol. III, p. 110.

4. Passerini, Altoviti, pp. 143-6, 150-6, 158-9, tavola XI; Dizionario biografico, p. 576; ASF, Catasto, 38, fol. 331v; ibid. 811, fol. 214v.

nardo di Paolo himself only played a minor role in the political life of the commune.¹ Moreover, Bernardo di Paolo's father and grandfather were not successful merchants like many of their relatives:² according to the Catasti of the fifteenth century they were barely able to make ends meet.³ The Altoviti name, however, still seems to have gone a long way in Florence, for Bernardo's sisters were married to members of the Ridolfi, Rondinelli and Strozzi families, three of the best known Florentine houses.⁴ Caterina Accolti made a good match in marrying Bernardo Altoviti; Bernardo himself, because his fortune was small, might not have expected to marry someone from a richer family.

The other Florentines whom Accolti's children married were no richer than Bernardo di Paolo: Giovanni di Guido Baldovinetti, the husband of his daughter Lucrezia; Giovanni di Bartolo Mori, the husband of Lisabetta Accolti; and Lucrezia di Giovanni Alamanni, the wife of his eldest son, Michele, all come from households which according to the tax records of the fifteenth century were not richer than Bernardo Altoviti's.⁵ But like the Altoviti, all these families enjoyed a high social position in Florence. The Baldovinetti were descended from a branch of the Conti

1. Passerini, Altoviti, p. 159; ASF, Manoscritti, 266, fol. 2v seq.

2. Cf. Martines, Social World, pp. 361, 373.

3. ASF, Catasto, 38, fol. 331r-331v; ibid. 74, fol. 163r; ibid. 811, fol. 214r-215r; ibid. 916, fol. 497r-498r.

4. On these families, cf. Ottokar, Il comune, pp. 48-51; Brucker, Florentine Politics, pp. 34, 203; Rubinstein, Government, pp. 3, 9, 48, 49, 153; Stefani, Cronaca, pp. 75, 78.

5. On the Baldovinetti, cf. ASF, Catasto, 38, fol. 333r-336v; ibid. 74, fol. 38r-39v; ibid. 811, fol. 260r-263v; ibid. 916, fol. 287r-288v. On the Mori, cf. ibid. 10, fol. 393r-394v; ibid. 75, fol. 253r; ibid. 814, fol. 5r-9v; ibid. 1009, fol. 229r-230r. On the Alamanni, cf. ibid. 16, fol. 490r-490v; ibid. 64, fol. 352r-353v; ibid. 785, fol. 408r-410r; ibid. 992, fol. 444r-445v; Decima Repubblicana, 1, fol. 534r-535r.

Guidi¹ and played a large part in Florentine political and commercial life, which was cut short by the triumph of the Medici in 1434.² The Alamanni were thought to have descended from German followers of Frederick Barbarossa³ and were active in communal life as early as the end of the twelfth century.⁴ In the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries they became more interested in business than public affairs, but gained prominence again during the fifteenth century.⁵ The Mori-Ubaladini had emigrated from Signa to Florence during the thirteenth century, and had at first encountered social prejudice.⁶ But by the fifteenth century they were as accepted as any of the leading Florentine families.⁷

It was not extraordinary for a family either newly arrived or risen in Florence such as the Accolti to contract marriage alliances which were socially advantageous; but usually such families were rich. Carlo Marsuppini, for example, married Caterina di Gherardo Corsini and Donato di Leonardo Bruni married Alessandra di Messer Michele

1. G. Corti, 'Le ricordanze trecentesche di Francesco e di Alessio Baldovinetti,' Archivio storico italiano, CXII (1954), p. 110; Ottokar, Il comune, p. 63.

2. Corti, 'Le ricordanze', pp. 110-2; BNF, Fondo Passerini, 185, fasc. 29, fol. 11-2; G. Villani, Cronica, VI, 80; Ottokar, Il comune, pp. 62-3; Davidsohn, Forschungen, vol. III, pp. 52, 140; 704; Stefani, Cronaca, p. 77; Brucker, Florentine Politics, pp. 199, 297, 323, 344, 383; G. Salvemini, La dignità cavalleresca nel comune di Firenze (Turin, 1960), p. 468; Delizie, vol. XX, pp. 184-5, 198, 201.

3. BNF, Fondo Passerini, 44, fol. 193-5; U. Verino, De illustratione urbis Florentiae (Paris, 1790), vol. III, p. 88.

4. BNF, Fondo Passerini, 44, fol. 193-6.

5. Il libro di Montaperti, pp. 123, 132, 146; Saporì, Studi, vol. III, pp. 87, 110; Davidsohn, Forschungen, vol. III, p. 159; BNF, Fondo Passerini, 44, fol. 196-265 passim.

6. Cf. Paradiso, XVI, 52 seq.

7. BNF, Fondo Passerini, 187, fasc. 73; ibid. 8, fol. 167; Libro di Montaperti, p. 87; Divina commedia, ed. T. Casini (Florence, 1903), p. 693.

Castellani, and both came from rich families.¹ Members of the Pucci and Cocchi-Donati families, who had become prominent in Florence only in the fifteenth century, married well and they too were rich.² Benedetto Accolti, on the other hand, had only a modest fortune, and yet his children could hardly have married better. The Accolti were a very able family and that may have helped them advance socially. Benedetto's brother, Francesco became one of the most famous civil and canon lawyers of the fifteenth century, and for seven years he was an advisor to Francesco Sforza. One of Benedetto's sons, Bernardo, was prominent in the Curia, eventually becoming the Signore of Nepi. Benedetto's son Pietro and his grandson Benedetto became two of the most influential cardinals of the early sixteenth century. Both were bishops in possession of numerous dioceses. Pietro was one of the leading authorities on canon law of his day and played an important role in such controversies as Henry VIII's divorce. Benedetto, the cardinal, gained considerable independent authority as papal vicar in Ancona and became a political power in his own right during the 1530's. Historians have too often overlooked the advantages provided by intellectual ability alone in later medieval society. Emphasis on wealth, family background, and political influence has obscured the obvious fact that success was often founded on capability. Men such as Leonardo Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini and Bartolomeo Scala attained a high social rank and accumulated a considerable fortune largely by virtue of their own talents. Contemporary opinion may also have helped the Accolti in society. Several Priorists make clear that the Accolti of Arezzo were not always regarded as newcomers to Florence, but sometimes as an old Florentine family.³ A similar impression may have been current in fifteenth-century Florence, so that the Accolti may not have encountered the same social prejudice as families such as the Pucci.

1. Martines, Social World, pp. 117-23, 127-31, 201 seq., 221 seq.

2. Ibid. pp. 71-4.

3. Cf. p. 11 above.

Although Benedetto Accolti settled permanently in Florence after becoming chancellor, he could not dissociate himself entirely from Arezzo. He kept a few pieces of land at Bagnena in the contado of Arezzo worth 42 florins 17s. 2d.¹ He remained in contact with his family in Arezzo. During the 1450's he had employed his cousin, Ser Angelo di Grazia Accolti, as his procurator,² and in the testament Ser Angelo made before his death in 1460 he named Accolti one of the guardians of his son, Matteo.³ In 1445 Accolti had arranged his sister Tomasa's marriage,⁴ and in 1456 she named him in the event of her own children's death, as one of her heirs.⁵

Accolti's appointment as first chancellor of Florence may be considered the turning point of his life. Before that time he was merely an Aretine living in Florence, maintaining his Aretine citizenship and retaining the property inherited from his father. He did not hesitate to seek a favourable position abroad, as for example at the Sienese Studio in 1456. Before 1458 there is little reason to assume that he might not have become an itinerant lawyer like his brother Francesco. After his election as chancellor, he and his family undoubtedly became Florentines: he became a Florentine citizen and by 1469 all of his property in the Aretino, with one small exception, had been exchanged for property near Florence. By the end of the century four of his children had married members of prominent Florentine families. Thus the course of Accolti's life was profoundly altered when he became chancellor. There is every reason to ask, therefore, what made the chancellorship so prestigious and influential a position.

1. ASF, Catasto, 929, fol. 610r.

2. ASF, Not. antecos., L 189 (1461-66), fol. 114r; ibid. S 1190 (not foliated).

3. Ibid. P 294 (1456-77), no. 14 (not foliated).

4. Ibid. P 290 (1441-46) (not foliated).

5. Ibid. P 294 (1456-77), no. 7 (not foliated).

In a rubric of a manuscript of the earliest extant compilation of Florentine statutes, the statutes of the Podestà of 1325, it was required that each year an experienced notary from the Florentine college of judges and notaries should be elected chancellor of Florence by the Signoria and Colleges. He was to serve as dictator litterarum et ambasciatorum of the commune and the Signoria, and to perform all the duties of the chancellor.¹ The traditional office of the chancellor was to write letters for the commune and draw up commissions and instructions for ambassadors, a responsibility which remained his throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.² But the chancellor was not responsible for all the correspondence of the Signoria. Frequently they sent orders, warrants or announcements that were written in the name of the Signoria itself, not in that of the commune, and were therefore drawn up by the Notaro della Signoria. It was the chancellor's job to write the letters of Signoria in their capacity as representatives of the commune, letters that were usually literary and rhetorical in character.³

The chancellor was not traditionally in charge of looking after every detail of ambassadorial missions, but only of drawing up ambassadors' instructions and corresponding with them. According to the Statutes it was the Notaro della Signoria's job to record the day each ambassador departed from and returned to Florence in a book that was to be kept in his office;⁴ that statute was confirmed by

1. ASF, Statuti, 7, fol. 16r, published by Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 544. This rubric is not included in the other complete manuscript of the Statutes of the Podestà, ASF, Statuti, 6, published by R. Caggese, Statuti della repubblica fiorentina (1910-21), vol. II. The manuscripts of the Statutes of 1322-5 have been discussed by G. Salvemini, 'Gli statuti fiorentini del Capitano e del Podestà degli anni 1322-25', Archivio storico italiano, serie V, XVIII (1896), pp. 66-97.

2. The rubric of the Statutes of 1355 is published by F. P. Luiso, 'Riforma della Cancelleria Fiorentina nel 1437', Archivio storico italiano, serie V, XXI (1898), pp. 132-3; Statuta populi et communis Florentie (1778-83), vol. II, p. 704.

3. Cf. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 354-5.

4. Ibid. pp. 364-5.

a provision of July 1361.¹ By the beginning of the fifteenth century, however, it had become the chancellor's responsibility to keep the register of ambassadors, and record in it the dates of their missions,² and it seems that he had been put in charge of administering all the other details of ambassadorial missions. In the Statutes of 1415, the rubric concerning the chancellor copied from the statutes of 1325 and 1355 was amended, so that to the last sentence it was added that the chancellor 'should record everything concerning ambassadors. . .'³ Besides noting the dates of their missions, the chancellor and no one else was required to keep a record of their elections as ambassadors, of the payments made to them, and of all other acts concerning them which had been approved by the Signoria and the Colleges.⁴ The chancellor was to be given a book by the Camerlinghi della Camera delle Arme in which he was to record the same information, and which apparently was to be kept in the Camera delle Arme.⁵ At the behest of the Signoria the chancellor was to record the instructions given to ambassadors and the reports made by them on their missions in order that those records might be available in the future.⁶ It was presumably in compliance with this instruction that in 1395 the series in the Florentine State Archives today called *Legazioni e Commissarie, Elezioni ed Istruzioni ad Oratori* began to appear, in which were copied not only the initial instructions given to ambassadors, but letters sent to them during their missions. At the same time another series was begun, today called *Rapporti e Relazioni d'Oratori*, which consisted of the reports made by ambassadors on their return to Florence. This series terminates in November, 1429,⁷ probably because

1. Ibid. p. 87.

2. Statuta, p. 705.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. p. 707.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid. p. 711.

7. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 531.

at that time it had been ordered that the reports of ambassadors were to be included in a new series consisting of all instructions, letters, and reports to and from ambassadors and the Signoria.¹ That series, however, was either never begun or has subsequently been destroyed, since none of the registers belonging to it are to be found.

By the end of the fourteenth century, therefore, the chancellor was responsible for administering all diplomatic missions for the Signoria, and it probably reflected his enhanced competence in diplomacy that at that time he is first known to have been put in charge of recording the Pratiche. Diplomacy played only a small part in the work of the legislative councils of Florence, and apart from the Dieci di Balìa, which was not a permanent office, it was only in the Pratiche and the meetings of the Signoria and Colleges that foreign affairs were regularly discussed. The Notaro della Signoria was responsible for recording the deliberations of the Signoria and Colleges but it is not known who was responsible for the earliest surviving volumes of the series now known as the Consulte e Pratiche. Coluccio Salutati was the first chancellor known to have recorded those debates and after that the chancellor or one of his coadjutors was regularly responsible for them.²

By the fifteenth century, therefore, the chancellor was not only dictator literarum et ambasciatarum but was in charge of administering most of the diplomatic affairs of the Signoria. At the end of the fourteenth century, moreover, he began regularly to hold other important administrative posts along with the chancellorship. The most important of these was the Notaro delle Tratte. Before 1374, the Notaro delle Riformagioni had been responsible for supervising the tratte or extractions for communal offices,³ but on 21 February of that^{year} he was provided with a coadjutor, in the person of Coluccio Salutati, to be in

1. Provvisione of 13 March 1430 (ab inc.) published ibid. pp. 589-90.

2. Cf. ibid. p. 135.

3. Ibid. pp. 111-2.

charge of the tratte.¹ After Salutati was elected chancellor on 21 May 1375, both he and Ser Pietro di Grifo, the Notaro delle Riformagioni, carried out the duties of the Notaro delle Tratte;² but on 28 July 1378 the responsibility for the tratte was formally taken from the Notaro delle Riformagioni and given to Salutati.³ As Notaro delle Tratte, Salutati was also Notaro delle Approvazioni degli Statuti delle Terre del Contado e Distretto,⁴ and he continued to hold both those offices until 1405, when his son, Bonifazio, was elected to them in his place.⁵ Bonifazio continued to be reelected Notaro delle Tratte and Notaro delle Approvazioni degli Statuti after Salutati's death,⁶ and Salutati's three successors, Benedetto Fortini, Pietro di Mino and Leonardo Bruni (in his first term as chancellor) were responsible for no other administrative offices besides the chancellorship. In 1411, however, the chancellor again began to have other posts; before his election in that year Paolo Fortini had been chancellor of the Dieci di Balìa and he continued to hold that office after he became chancellor.⁷ Moreover, he became Notaro delle Tratte e delle Approvazioni degli Statuti, gaining greater responsibilities in the chancellery than any of his predecessors.

The duties of the chancellor increased unevenly during the later fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. From June 1376 to June 1377, because of the extra work arising from the War of the Eight Saints or the Ufficio delle Tratte, Ser Benedetto Fortini shared the chancellorship with Salutati.⁸ Then in 1405, the office of the Tratte was made autonomous, not to be reunited with the chancellorship until 1411. And in 1415 the office of the Appro-

1. Ibid. p. 112.

2. Ibid. pp. 117-8.

3. Ibid. p. 118.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid. pp. 134, 148.

6. Ibid. pp. 150, 183.

7. Ibid. pp. 160-1, 183.

8. Ibid. p. 119.

vazioni degli Statuti was placed under the Notaro delle Riformagioni.¹ But if the period between 1375 and 1425 is considered as a whole, clearly the responsibilities of the chancellor had been greatly increased. As chancellor of the Signoria he was now in charge of administering all the diplomatic affairs of the Signoria; as Notaro delle Tratte he was responsible for supervising the estrazioni, scrutini, imborsazioni, and giuramenti of the new officials;² as chancellor of the Dieci, he had to administer the conduct of foreign wars and the diplomacy connected with them. It is not surprising that in 1412 Ser Paolo Fortini was permitted to be exempted from the Tre Maggiori or any office whose hours coincided with those of the chancellery.³ And it is not difficult to understand why, if before 1420 the chancellorship had been consolidated with other offices, after that time the chancellor's duties became more and more highly specialized.

The chancellor's duties began to be lessened in 1423; after that time Ser Domenico di Arrigo Mucini and Ser Filippo di Ser Ugolino Pieruzzi, instead of Paolo Fortini, were alternately chancellors of the Dieci.⁴ When Leonardo Bruni was again elected chancellor in 1427, he was not made chancellor of the Dieci; at his own request,⁵ the office of the Tratte was separated from the chancellorship and entrusted to Ser Filippo Pieruzzi.⁶ The chancellor, therefore, was once again responsible for only the offices with which he had been invested by the Statutes, but in 1437 his duties were even further restricted. In that year a reform of the chancellery was enacted whereby there were

1. Ibid. pp. 163-4, 180.

2. Ibid. pp. 112, 169.

3. Ibid. p. 161.

4. Ibid. p. 206.

5. Cf. Poggio's letter to Bruni in Shepherd-Tonelli, Vita di Poggio, vol. I, p. 148.

6. Cf. Luiso, 'Riforma', p. 134; Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 190, 206.

henceforth to be two chancellors instead of one. Bruni, who was to be first chancellor, would remain in charge of administering the diplomatic affairs of the commune, writing letters and supervising ambassadorial missions to foreign states; the second chancellor, who was to be Ser Giovanni di Guiduccio di Riccio, would be responsible for writing letters sent within Florentine territory, and for issuing safe-conducts.¹ Ser Giovanni remained second chancellor until his death in January 1453; at that time, it was decided not to replace him but to reunite the two parts of the chancellery under the supervision of Marsuppini.²

Nevertheless, the former constitution of the chancellery had ~~been~~[^] only nominally restored, since the chancellor had been provided with an additional coadjutor to replace the second chancellor; it appears too that separate registers of the second chancellery continued to be compiled as before.³ Poggio like Marsuppini was elected as the only chancellor, and during his term of office, just as during Marsuppini's the registers of the second chancellery seem to have been carried on.⁴ But the chancellery did not remain reunited for long; in April 1458 Benedetto Accolti was elected first chancellor only.⁵ There must have been a second chancellor at that time, although only at the beginning of 1459 does his identity become clear. At the end of Marsuppini's term of office, Ser Antonio di Mariano

1. Luiso, 'Riforma', pp. 136-8; Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 196-7.

2. Luiso, 'Riforma', pp. 138-40; Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 214.

3. Ibid. There are no registers of the Missive of the second chancellery between 1445 and 1470; the Missive of the first chancellor from those years do not include letters sent within Florentine territory or safe-conducts.

4. Ibid. p. 221; Luiso, 'Riforma', pp. 140-1.

5. ASF, Balie, 29, fol. 60r (7 October 1458): '. . . Dominus Benedictus olim Domini Michaelis de Accoltis de mense aprilis proxime preteriti vacantia cancellarie ipsorum dominorum pro principali cancellario fuit per habentes auctoritatem electus in primum cancellarium cancellarie predicte pro uno anno. . .'

Muzi had been the principal coadjutor in the chancellery, replacing the second chancellor, Ser Giovanni di Guiduccio, and now in January 1459 he was granted the privilege of practising privately as a notary while he was second chancellor.¹ There is no extant record of when Muzi was first elected second chancellor,² but one may speculate that it was at the beginning of 1457. In the Pratiche convened to discuss the reform of the chancellery at that time, it was recommended that Poggio be elected first chancellor and Muzi, second chancellor;³ it is probable that this suggestion was actually carried out, since in April 1458 it was only necessary to elect a first and not a second chancellor.

Even in Accolti's time the responsibilities of the chancellor remained considerable. One historian has been led to write, 'Scrivere lettere esterne apparentemente è opera di notaio e di retore; in realtà, secondo la persona del Cancelliere, e il suo prestigio, funzione delicatissima de segretario di stato permanente per gli affari esteri.'⁴ 'The chancellorship of Florence,' another scholar has recently written, 'became an important position during Salutati's incumbency, partly because he had the qualities to make it such and partly because the permanence of his tenure gave him the opportunity to develop his talents. As official letter writer he became essentially the foreign minister of Florence.'⁵ 'The real importance of Salutati's office lay. . . in the powers attached to it,' a third has said; 'through these he could influence decisions of state. This is why on one occasion the Signoria, concealing one of its diplomatic moves from the Ten of War, also withheld it from the Chancellery head. He was evidently too close

1. Luiso, 'Riforma', p. 141; Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 231.

2. Ibid.

3. Cf. Walser, Poggius, p. 406.

4. E. Garin, 'I cancellieri umanisti della Repubblica Fiorentina da Coluccio Salutati a Bartolomeo Scala', Rivista storica italiana, LXXI (1959), p. 187.

5. B. L. Ullman, The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati (Padua, 1963), p. 11.

to certain members of the Ten or thoroughly shared their outlook. . . The first secretary also dictated the Signoria's correspondence to Florentine ambassadors; he was present (except on very rare occasions) at all the meetings of the executive councils, and the discussions were recorded under his supervision. Consequently, because of his long and intimate association with the Signoria, whose personnel changed six times yearly, his advice on special questions was often solicited.¹

These and other historians have maintained that the chancellorship carried with it political power and that the chancellor could exert influence on policy decisions. It must be pointed out, however, that communal legislation never gave the chancellor authority to give advice on, much less decide, any political question. His statutory powers were solely administrative: writing letters on behalf of the Signoria, supervising ambassadorial missions, writing up the debates of the Pratiche. Nevertheless, it is possible that he may have had an influence on policy beyond his official powers: he may have advised the Signoria on what to say in their letters to foreign states or ambassadors, or he may have included on his own initiative personal ideas or opinions in those letters. The missive that are preserved in the Archivio di Stato in Florence are only copies of the letters written by the chancellor and do not indicate where the ideas of the Signoria end and those of the chancellor begin. The minutari reveal the missive in their preliminary form, but one is confronted by the same problem of how great a part the chancellor played in writing the minutari themselves. One could not therefore learn what influence the chancellor had on the contents of the missive by comparing them with the minutari; moreover, it would be impossible during the years that Accolti was chancellor, as the minutari between 1431 and 1465 have not survived.²

It is possible too that the chancellor may have been

1. Martines, Social World, p. 148.

2. Cf. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 528.

called to advise the government on political questions. Leading citizens and public officials, such as the Ufficiali del Monte or the Sei di Mercanzia, were usually asked for their advice in the Pratiche and their opinions were noted in the records of those debates. But a close study of the registers of the Pratiche from 1446 to 1462 has not revealed that the chancellor gave his opinion and it was never suggested that his opinion be sought.¹ In the published literature on the chancellery, it has been mentioned on one occasion only that the chancellor was consulted in the Pratiche, and even then it is unclear what the nature was of the advice sought.² The only evidence that the chancellor took part in the Pratiche is provided by Vespasiano da Bisticci in his life of Bruni, where he said that Bruni 'was called to all the Pratiche', in itself an ambiguous phrase. He wrote that when Pope Eugenius IV was in Florence in 1443 and wanted to return to Rome, the Florentines were urged by the Venetians to keep him in Florence. Bruni was present at a Pratica called by the Signoria on the question; he alone advised that the Pope should be permitted to go and he carried the day. A citizen whose name is withheld criticized Bruni for his advice and the following day Bruni justified himself before the Signoria and Colleges.³ This account cannot be verified, for the records of the Pratiche from 1436 to 1445 have not survived. The incident may have occurred but Vespasiano's account is suspect in several respects. He says that Bruni was eighty at the time but he was actually seventy-three. He says that the chancellor ordinarily spoke last in the Pratiche, but this practice is not confirmed by any other evidence. Vespasiano was twenty-one at the time and when he came to write his life of Bruni more than forty years later, he certainly wrote what he thought Bruni must have said, as was customary in writing history or biography. Whether or not Vespasiano was accurate about Bruni, there

1. ASF, CP, 52-56.

2. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 137.

3. Vite, pp. 474-7.

is little reason to assume that the chancellor regularly gave advice in the Pratiche.

The chancellor may have advised the Signoria on political questions in a less formal capacity, for example, while the Signoria were deciding amongst themselves what to write to a foreign government or what authority to give an ambassador. In his letters Salutati occasionally said that he had made recommendations to the Signoria or had given them counsel. Thus writing to Francesco Bruni on 14 April 1380 he said, '... I have recommended you to our Signori as you requested, and they were pleased to hear of you. They spoke of you in the most laudatory tone and if you would believe that I could still harbour any envious thoughts towards you, then this amount of praise would assuredly have provoked such passions.'¹ Another time he wrote that 'to our country. . . we owe our lives and I have worked for it by giving counsel.'² In his life of Bruni, Vespasiano said that on one occasion it was due to Bruni's support that Giannozzo Manetti was made an ambassador to Genoa; and in his life of Accolti he wrote that 'in all disagreements that arose before the Signoria, they sent for Messer Benedetto, and with his help they quickly resolved the difficulty.'³ But whatever evidence exists to suggest that the government took the chancellor's advice outside the Pratiche is vague and uncorroborated by official sources.

The chancellor may have exercised political influence by using his office to further the interests of a faction, for example, by revealing diplomatic secrets and compromising the Signoria. For example, Rinaldo degli Albizzi and Michele Castellani writing to the chancellor, Ser Paolo Fortini from Naples on 2 November 1421, may have been requesting political news when they asked him to 'avisarci di qualche novella licita, dal lato di costà;' but what they were after must remain unclear, since Fortini answered, 'qua non ha novelle, e però non ve ne scrivo.'⁴ Fortini

1. Epistolario, vol. I, p. 344.

2. Ibid. vol. II, p. 133.

3. Vite, pp. 480-1, 596.

4. Le commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi, ed. C. Guasti (Florence, 1867-73), vol. I, pp. 331, 354.

however, was removed from office in 1427, and according to one contemporary account, the esamina of Ser Niccolò Tinucci, it was for political reasons. Tinucci was questioned by the Otto di Guardia in September 1433 and under torture told what he knew of the subversive activities of the Medici. The Medici, he maintained, favoured the Notaro delle Riformagioni, Ser Martino Martini, whereas Niccolò da Uzzano's party supported Fortini. In November 1427, Luigi Vecchietti, who was a personal enemy of Fortini's, was drawn as a Prior; Tinucci stated that Giovanni de' Medici, in order to embarrass his opponents, bribed Vecchietti and some of his colleagues to remove Fortini from office.¹ Tinucci's testimony, therefore, implies that the chancellorship was a subject of political dispute in the 1420's and that Giovanni de' Medici was attempting to get at Niccolò da Uzzano and his partisans through Fortini. His evidence has been dismissed out of hand by some modern historians because it had been disclosed under torture or because it was said to be neither internally consistent nor corroborated by other evidence.² But in the most recent study of the period, it has been shown that Tinucci's esamina as a whole is verified by other sources including the private letters of the Medici and that what he said about the chancellor in particular agrees with other information known about the Medici party at that time.³ For example, Tinucci, Martini and Vecchietti were all Medici partisans⁴ and Ser Paolo Fortini was a leading member of the opposing faction.⁵ However, Tinucci's account of the Medici's role in Fortini's dismissal is not borne out by other evidence; it seems rather

1. Published in G. Cavalcanti, Istorie fiorentine (Florence, 1838-9), vol. II, pp. 399-400.

2. G. Capponi, Storia della Repubblica di Firenze (Florence, 1930), vol. I, pp. 510-1; F. C. Pellegrini, 'Sulla Repubblica Fiorentina a tempo di Cosimo il Vecchio', Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Filosofia e Filologia, III (1880), pp. 232-4, 253, 314-5.

3. Kent, Political Alignments, pp. 293-4.

4. Ibid. p. 297.

5. Ibid. pp. 294-5.

that Vecchietti acted against Fortini for personal reasons, and had not been under instructions from the leaders of the Medici party.¹ Thus Giuliano de' Medici wrote to Averardo that 'yesterday morning, when Luigi Vecchietti was making proposals for the Signoria, the chancellor was dismissed, for he had hated him for a long time; it turns out, as with other matters, that some like it, others, not.'² On the previous day Cosimo wrote to Averardo that 'this morning the Signoria dismissed the chancellor; Luigi Vecchietti made the proposal. Many reasons have been alleged; I believe it was hatred and enmity rather than anything else.'³ Since Cosimo himself was not sure of Vecchietti's motives, it is safe to say that his father, Giovanni, did not have the role in the affair attributed to him by Tinucci. Although the Medici were certainly not favourably disposed to Fortini, their letters indicate that the chancellorship was more a subject of personal enmity than of political rivalry.

In short, there is very little evidence to suggest that the office of chancellor carried with it political power. But some chancellors may have exercised a personal political influence and may have been members of the regime (stato) in their own right rather than in their capacity as chancellors. Vespasiano said that Bruni 'was given lo stato', by which it was meant that he held important political offices,⁴ and during the last seven years of his life he was once a member of the Dodici Buonomini, three times a member of the Dieci di Balìa, once a member of the Otto di Guardia, and just before he died, a Prior.⁵ He held several other minor offices,⁶ but his role in government can in no way be compared with that of the leading

1. Ibid. pp. 297-8.

2. Ibid. p. 298.

3. Ibid.

4. Vite, p. 473.

5. Martines, Social World, pp. 170-5.

6. Ibid. p. 174.

members of the stato. Vespasiano said that Bruni, being 'molto riputato', was made one of the Priors and the Dieci di Balìa and one may suppose that he was honoured more because of his great reputation at the end of his life than because he was one of the leading members of the reggimento. Poggio was made a Prior in 1455 and Vespasiano explicitly said that it was 'to honour him with the honours of the city' that 'they made him one of the Priors.'¹

Bruni and Poggio were the only chancellors who held political offices during their terms as chancellors and only Ser Paolo Fortini can be shown to have been a member of the stato. Fortini may not have been dismissed for political reasons but it was certainly of no help to him that he was so closely connected with Niccolò da Uzzano's friends. On the contrary, the chancellors were ordinarily not a party to conflicts within the reggimento; both Bruni and Salutati, in fact, remained in office despite numerous changes of regime.

There were special features of the chancellorship, nevertheless, which distinguished it from other administrative offices of the commune. The main duty of the chancellor was to write letters, and during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries epistolary composition had become the subject of specialized rhetorical study, the ars dictaminis. Based on practical manuals and collections of examples, the new method of teaching and writing was widely practised especially in France and Italy, and became an established part of the university curriculum. The ars dictaminis became more elaborate after the middle of the thirteenth century: a new style of dictating letters was developed, called the stilus altus, which was derived from the rhymed prose of late antiquity and which was characterized by metaphor and rhyme. The stilus altus became fashionable throughout Europe and the earliest surviving letters of the Florentine commune were the work of professional dicatores, trained in the ars dictaminis and the stilus

1. Vite, p. 547.

altus.¹ In the statutes of 1325 it was explicitly stated that the chancellor should be 'in arte dictaminis expertus', a phrase which was repeated in the statutes of 1355 and 1415.² By that time, however, avant-garde rhetoricians were no longer trained in the stilus altus but in the studia humanitatis and it is only natural that the Florentines should have wanted their chancellor to be proficient in the latest rhetorical techniques.

In the fifteenth century the chancellor came to be responsible for giving public orations on certain state occasions. Thus Leonardo Bruni greeted both the Patriarch of Constantinople and Byzantine Emperor with orations in Greek on behalf of the Signoria when they entered Florence to take part in the council of 1439.³ Carlo Marsuppini welcomed Emperor Frederick III to Florence with a Latin oration when he was on his way to Rome to be crowned in 1453.⁴ In the thirteenth century the art of public speaking had been connected with the ars dictaminis and sometimes examples of orations were collected in the same volumes as examples of letters.⁵ The ars arengandi never

1. The well-known letter sent by the Florentines to Pavia to justify the death in 1258 of the Abbot of Valombrosa was certainly the work of a trained dictator; it is published by G. C. Gebauer, in Leben und denckwürdige Thaten Herrn Richards erwählten Romischen Kayzers, Grafens von Cornwall und Poitou (Leipzig, 1744), pp. 571-5. Significantly, the first chancellor of Florence whose identity is known was Brunetto Latini, a rhetorician trained in the stilus altus: 'Brunetto Latini. . . fu sommo maestro in rettorica, tanto in ben sapere dire come in bene dittare. . . fu dittatore del nostro comune' (G. Villani, Cronica, VIII, 10). On the ars dictaminis in general, cf. C. H. Haskins, Studies in Medieval Culture (Oxford, 1929), chapters I, VI, IX; C. S. Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic to 1400 Interpreted from Representative Works (New York, 1928), pp. 206-227; H. Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century', pp. 351-70, 384-91 and 'Ars Dictaminis in the time of Dante', Medievalia et Humanistica, I (1943), pp. 95-108.

2. Cf. Marzi, La cancelleria, p. 544; Luiso, 'Riforma', p. 133; Statuta, vol. II, p. 704.

3. J. Gill, The Council of Florence (Cambridge, 1959), p. 183.

4. Cf. pp. 80-1 above.

5. Wieruszowski, 'Ars Dictaminis', pp. 102-3.

became as widely practised as the ars dictaminis and even in the fifteenth century rhetoric remained for the most part a written rather than a spoken art. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries nevertheless interest was revived in classical literary forms that were oral in character even though written, such as the dialogue and the oration; the chancellor's new responsibilities for public speaking were thus simply an extension of his old association with rhetoric.

The office to which Accolti was elected was that of an administrator and rhetorician. There is little evidence that it involved political responsibility, and yet it was an office of sufficient importance to induce Accolti to make Florence his home. Indeed, one must not assume that the chancellor was a minor communal official simply because he had no part in making political decisions. Accolti's predecessors, Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, Carlo Marsuppini and Poggio Bracciolini, had been men of great reputation, who gave the office a prestige that must not be underestimated. It was because the chancellor had for so long been a man of fame and learning that the speakers in the Pratiche of 1456 agreed that Poggio must remain chancellor. Indeed the chancellor was an official of such consequence that when he died in office he was often accorded a public funeral. The expenses of the funerals of Chello Baldovini in 1336 and of Ser Ventura Monachi in 1348 were met by the commune.¹ Salutati was given a public funeral in 1406 which cost 973 lire 10s. and probably exceeded what had been spent on funerals of his predecessors,² and Ser Benedetto Fortini was granted a public funeral in 1407.³ It is not known how much Bruni's public funeral cost, but it was probably at least 1500 florins since that was the grant made for Marsuppini's funeral in 1453.⁴ It has been pointed out that what was spent on the funerals of chancell-

1. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 68, 81.

2. Ibid. p. 149.

3. Ibid. p. 156.

4. Ibid. p. 215.

ors far exceeded the cost of funerals accorded to other public officials;¹ that may be regarded as an indication of the great esteem that the chancellor enjoyed in Florence during the fifteenth century.

As chancellor Accolti continued to write letters abroad and keep copies of them just as his predecessors had done.² All formal letters were written in Latin, which was classical in style. Letters to certain persons such as the Duke of Milan were written in the Volgare; if it was necessary to write a more formal letter to a person to whom the Signoria ordinarily wrote in Italian, as for example when the Duke of Milan became Signore of Genoa in 1463,³ it was written in Latin. This practice of writing letters for the commune in either Italian or Latin dated back at least to the early fourteenth century.⁴

Under Accolti's administration the legazioni, commissioni and missive to ambassadors continued to be copied in registers separate from the missive to foreign states, a practice which had begun in 1399. What was altered by Accolti was the manner in which the debates of the Pratiche were transcribed. While Bruni was chancellor the debates were recorded in much the same way as they had been during the fourteenth century. Notes were probably made by the chancellor or his coadjutor during the meetings, and these were subsequently copied into the registers that are extant today. There was probably no intermediate copy, because the registers were not written in book-hand or elegant flowing cursive, but only in neat everyday chancery script. Moreover their language is simple and direct; no attempt was made to write the debates in a literary style. They were written in the third person, but not in true indirect discourse since frequently the first person plural was used. Moreover, clauses of indirect speech were introduced by quod instead of being constructed with the

1. Martines, Social World, pp. 239-45.

2. The missive from Accolti's term are ASF, Missive, 42-4.

3. ASF, Missive, 44, fol. 150v-151r.

4. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 421 seq.

infinitive.¹ While Marsuppini was chancellor, the debates were still transcribed in simple language and written in ordinary script; it is possible that they were still transcribed directly from notes made at the meetings. But under Marsuppini they were usually written in better Latin; indirect discourse was used and the rules governing it were followed.² It has already been pointed out that under Poggio the condition of the records of the Pratiche deteriorated drastically. They were written in extremely careless script and may even not have been a copy but the actual notes made at the meetings. The practice of using classical Latin constructions that Marsuppini had initiated was abandoned, and they were once again written in a haphazard combination of indirect and direct discourse.³ When Accolti became chancellor, he revived Marsuppini's use of classical Latin as the language of the debates. Moreover, he began to have his coadjutor, Ser Bastiano di Ser Antonio Foresi, make a fair copy of the debates in a fine, calligraphic cursive script. A fair copy compiled with such care would seem to presuppose an intermediate set of minutes existing between the notes and the finished copy, and that is further suggested by the nature of language of the debates. For whereas Marsuppini had the debates transcribed in simple though correct Latin, the fair copy of the debates made under Accolti's direction was written in indirect discourse of such complexity as to resemble the reported speeches found in Roman historians. Thus in a speech given in 1449 while Marsuppini was chancellor, Matteo Palmieri was reported to have said, 'nihil imprudentius /sic for prudentius_7 esse quam rei publice eius status antea quam eveniat providere. Nec dubium esse securius fore marsupia esse aperta quam clausa. Et quamvis videatur magis popolare ut clau-

1. Cf. for example, Appendice di documenti tratti dal R. Archivio di Stato di Firenze (Pisa, 1891), ed. F. C. Pellegrini, pp. cccx seq., ccxxviii seq., ccxxxiii seq., ccxlv seq.

2. Cf. for example ASF, CP, 52, fol. 75v-77r.

3. Cf. for example ASF, CP, 54, fol. 86r-89v.

dantur, tamen illi popularitati securitatem anteponebam. Nec ad sex menses esse reducendum cum id magis ad albas quam ad nigras provocaret. Et tandem securitati dixit esse prospiciendum'.¹ The Latin is correct, but the style is unpretentious. On the other hand, the speeches made by Palmieri while Accolti was chancellor are more elaborate in style as well as more complex in argument. For example, on one occasion in 1460 he was said to have begun a speech on ecclesiastical taxation with an introduction on the different types of republic: 'si quis recte velit consulere, considerare ipsum debere duas esse republicas: unam particularem, id est, eam civitatem in qua quis origine vel constitutione sit civis et pro illa tuenda aut servanda quamque civem debere fortunas, liberos et vitam denique suam exponere, quoniam a natura ipsa et a legibus decretum est ut ipsam rem publicam cunctis aliis rebus referamus. Alteram vero rem publicam universalem Christianorum omnium qui obligati sunt ad tuendam Christianam fidem adversus barbaros.'²

There was clearly an intermediate set of minutes of the Pratiche in which the elaborate style of the speeches after 1458 could be worked out and from which a fair copy could be made. Accolti must himself have written this version, since Ser Bastiano Foresi would have been incapable of writing Latin of such high quality. Moreover, there is evidence that the differences both of content and of form evident in the speeches of the Pratiche after 1458 did not result from changes in the manner in which the speeches were actually delivered but rather were the work of Accolti himself. For a page of what were the notes made at the meetings of the Pratiche while Accolti was chancellor has survived, in addition to the finished copy of the same debate. The debate occurred on 24 February 1461 and the two versions of what was discussed at that time are found in volume 56 of the Consulte e Pratiche, fol. 140v-141v and 160r-160v,³ the former being the finished copy and the latter,

1. ASF, CP, 52, fol. 76r.

2. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 60r-60v.

3. Cf. Appendix II.

the rough copy. It is evident from the handwriting that the rough copy was written by Ser Bastiano and it was clearly recorded at the meeting itself since each of the participants signed in his own hand at the end of the debate to the effect that he agreed with what had been advised by the Pratica. It appears to have been bound by accident in the register of fair copies and it seems to be complete in itself, since at the top of the page the date is written indicating the beginning of the debate. With regard to content the two versions differ significantly. Thus the short speech made by Giovanni Bartoli is omitted in the rough copy but included in the finished version; it seems to have been an accident that it was left out by Forese at the meeting, since in the rough copy Bartoli was said to have attended the Pratica. The first important difference between the versions is that the rough copy does not include the speech in which the Gonfaloniere of Justice introduced the subject to be discussed. It might be assumed that the speech, like Bartoli's, had not been noted during the meeting or that it had been written on another sheet of paper; but then it must be asked why only the Gonfaloniere's speech should have been omitted in the rough copy without any indication that it had been given, or why the notes should appear to be complete in themselves. Alternatively it may have happened that on this occasion no introduction was given and that in order to make the records consistent a speech was composed. That seems more probable in the light of other differences between the versions; for it was clearly the chancellor's intention to turn rough and simple speeches into polished prose. Whereas Manno Temperani in the rough version said, 'verba sua futura brevia,' in the finished copy he more eloquently states 'rem hanc longiorem orationem non poscere'; in the rough copy he continues, saying 'posse ipsum adhibere remedia que nobis obirentur et cogerent cives ad mutandam opinionem,' while in the finished version he says more rhetorically, 'satius esse libenter cives illi obsequi quam coactos postea et invitos mutare voluntatem. Habere enim pontificem remedia plurima quibus cum ignominia et dedecore compeleret (sic)

civitatem ut sibi obtemperaret.' Otto Niccolini too says in the first version, 'nec esse parem conditionem Florentinorum et aliorum esse,' but in the second version he is made to say 'aliam enim esse cum pontifice Florentinorum conditionem, aliam aliorum esse.' All the revisions made in the finished version involve improving the style of the rough copy, but sometimes it was taken to the point of changing the details of what had actually been argued. Thus Manno Temperani never in fact stated that the pope's request was just and equitable and that it was well known that he had full jurisdiction over the clergy; nevertheless in the finished copy he is reported to have said, 'satis cuique patere potest petitionem pontificis adeo iustam et equam esse et honeste negari nullo modo queat. Omnes enim scire ac fateri pontificem potestatem habere de clericis quemadmodum velit statuendi.' Moreover, his statement in the rough copy that the city was enjoying prosperity 'ex navigatione triremenium que cum magna reputatione reverse sunt' is omitted in the finished version. In Otto Niccolini's original statement, too, it was not pointed out explicitly that there were two alternatives facing Florence, certain detriment or goodwill and peace; and whereas Franco Sachetti in his original speech only said, 'audisse se quoque papam fuisse in dispositione ut prohibeat mercaturam apud barbaros. Si ergo negaretur prohiberet navigationem in damnum civitatis,' in the final version he was reported to have said that it was at the Congress of Mantua that the pope had been of a mind to ban all trade with the Turks and that he had only with great difficulty been dissuaded from that course of action. As the author of the intermediate minutes, Accolti was responsible for the character of the finished version, and therefore was the source of the newly embellished arguments and more elaborate prose style characterizing the Pratiche after 1458.

Accolti evidently took great care in composing his version of the Pratiche debates and in the interest of eloquence did not hesitate to alter the details of what was said. His concern did not cease once the finished version had been handed to Forese to be copied; for he went over

the text after it had been written out and changes and corrections in his hand may still be seen in the registers. At times he only added a word that had apparently been omitted by Foresi; thus 'civitatem' was omitted from the sentence 'ob defectum exercitiorum quibus civitas hec semper crevit et substantata est fere civitatem defecisse.'¹ At other times he added entire phrases which are sometimes rather forced in character, giving the impression of having been fitted into a sentence already composed in order to give the argument greater clarity. Thus whereas on one occasion it was simply said, 'attenta varietate fortune in rebus cunctis et quantum longo iam tempore civitas ista procul ab ea gubernatione fuit que salutem et gloriam civitatibus soleat parere,' he added in the margin after parere 'censuit omnino providendum esse ut meliore in loco poneretur' to complete the reasoning of the speaker.²

The same care that was given to the records of the Pratiche was devoted to a series of registers which first appeared under Accolti's administration. The Legazioni e Commissarie, Risposte Verballi di Oratori consists of formal speeches delivered by foreign ambassadors in Florence and the replies made to them by the Gonfaloniere of Justice. There is only one register of these speeches extant from Accolti's term of office; apparently the other volumes in the series have been lost, since it resumes after 1465, continuing until 1495 and there is no indication in the volume from 1458 to 1461 that it had been left incomplete. The reports of what was said were copied by Foresi with the same calligraphic, cursive script used for the Pratiche and Missive, and they were written in complex oratio obliqua similar to that used for the Pratiche. Thus on 14 April 1459 the papal ambassador came to Florence to announce that the pope would shortly be arriving in Florence: 'venit ad magnificos dominos Magister Stefanus Prothonotarius et Referendarius Apostolice Sedis, summi pontificis orator et, presentatis credentie litteris, dixit se missum

1. ASF, CP, 55. fol. 24r.

2. Ibid. fol. 30r.

a pontifice ut illis imprimis significaret pontificem ipsum brevi ad civitatem hanc cum sua curia venturum. Et quamquam existimet florentinos dominos pro summa in ^aem benivolentia pro veteri consuetudine proque suis egregiis et omnem commoditatem curie facturos sue, tamen ipsum cupere ut vel domini ipsi vel deputandi ad hanc rem cives una cum oratore ipso de ordine agende rei, cum tempus ad-erit, colloquantur. Et legatus ipse que agenda intelliget pontifici suis litteris significabit.' The Gonfaloniere of Justice, Angelo Vettori, answered the legate, 'pergratum fuisse oratoris adventum ipsis et letissimis animis audivisse illos unum pontificem christianorum omnium patrem virtute prestantissimum ad hanc civitatem brevi perventurum, presertim quoniam pontifex ipse semper florentine urbi magnam benivolentiam ostendisset. Et quamquam meritis eidem honor haberi nequaquam possit, tamen adnixuros dominos ne qui omissum sit quod ad honorandum eum et curiales omnes et ad quemcumque eorum commoda pertinere videatur. Et ob hoc plurimos delegisse cives prestantissimos qui omnia que in rem fore videbuntur diligenter statuunt. Daturus quoque operam dominos ut cives illi de his rebus omnibus una cum oratore ipso colloquantur.' Then the legate spoke again, thanking 'magnificis dominis pro his que benigne obtulerunt. Et optime ab illis provisum esse, qui, quoniam multis negotiis impliciti sunt, alios cives super hoc adventu pontificis celebrando delegerunt. Et ipsum daturum operam ut cum illis adsit et que honeste sciri potuerunt ab illis intelligat quisnammodus in pontifice honorando.'¹ There is no evidence that Angelo Vettori was a classical scholar, nor would most Gonfalonieri nor many ambassadors have been adequately educated to have delivered orations in such complex Latin; just as in the records of the Pratiche, therefore, Accolti may be considered responsible for the style and perhaps even some of the content of these speeches.

Under Accolti another type of register was first compiled called a quaternus containing 'omnes et singulae deliberationes, factae per Dominos et Collegia aut per

1. ASF, Leg. e Com., Risposte Verbali di Oratori, I, fol. 31v-32r.

Dominos tantum'.¹ It did not actually consist of the records of all the deliberations of the Signoria and Colleges, which were kept by the Notaro della Signoria, but only of those pertaining to foreign affairs. For the most part it was a diary of the letters sent by the Signoria to foreign governments, persons not subject to Florence, and ambassadors, but in it were noted as well the deliberations whereby ambassadors were elected by the Signoria, the Colleges, and the Consiglio del Cento. It was kept in the form of a diary, entries being made according to the day on which the matter was discussed, and therefore it comprises a day-to-day account^{of} all the business carried out by the first chancellor, with the exception of the Pratiche. The language used was Latin, but the style was notarial. It was presumably intended for the chancellor's own use since the records kept for the Signoria, namely the Pratiche records, Missive, Legazioni ed Commissarie, are written in a literary style. It occasionally gives additional information, such as the name of the person who carried a letter or the number of votes by which a measure was approved by the Signoria.² In fact it is a complete record of all the letters sent by the Signoria between 1 January 1459 and 28 June 1468, but the elections of some ambassadors, such as those of Pietro Acciaiuoli on 7 March 1462 or Otto Niccolini on 25 August 1463, were omitted.³ There is no other register like it extant in the Archivio di Stato and it has been suggested that it was the only one of its kind.⁴

Accolti was diligent in executing his duties as chancellor, as much so as any of his predecessors. All letters and instructions to ambassadors were written in a literary style, and copied into registers with a consistently fine

1. ASF, Carte di Corredo, 64, fol. 1r, now published by M. del Piazzo, Il protocollo del carteggio della Signoria di Firenze. 1459-68 (Rome, 1969), p. 21.

2. Ibid. pp. 25, 33, 35, 38, 39, etc.

3. Ibid. passim.

4. Ibid. p. 5.

cursive script. He was the first chancellor to devote the same care to the Pratiche as to the Missive. He initiated two new types of registers, one a record of the audiences granted to foreign ambassadors, the other a diary for his own use of what letters had been written and who had been elected ambassadors. But there is one archival series of which, although containing entries dating from his term of office, he was not the initiator. The Responsive Copiari consists of copies of letters sent to the commune by foreign states, the first entry of which dates back to 1453. The first register, continuing until 1468, was not written in the hand of any of Poggio's coadjutors nor of Ser Bastiano Foresi. When the register was actually compiled is clear from a provision of the Ballo of 1466. For there it was stated that at no time in the past had the letters sent to the Signoria been copied into a register, but rather had been placed in a file ('filza') only to be frequently mislaid. Since it would be useful to have such a record, it was ordered that all letters from foreign states or persons not subject to Florence be transcribed word for word into a register to be kept in the chancellery. It would be the responsibility of the first chancellor to look after this register and moreover he would be required to collect all extant letters sent in the past to the Signoria and see that they too were copied out.¹ Clearly the first volume of these Responsive was not written at the instigation of Poggio or Accolti, but rather of Bartolomeo Scala acting in accordance with this provision.

Accolti's efficiency was evident from the number of coadjutors who assisted him as chancellor. During the first half of the fifteenth century these had been becoming more numerous at considerable expense to the commune. Throughout the fourteenth century the chancellor had always had one coadjutor, even at the time Salutati was Notaro delle Tratte.² Salutati's successors continued to have

1. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 594-5.

2. Ibid. pp. 62, 68, 71, 80, 86-7, 93, 119, 125, 132, 134, 139.

only one coadjutor until Ser Paolo Fortini became chancellor.¹ At first he was provided with only one coadjutor,² but evidently because of the numerous additional offices he had taken on he came to have five coadjutors to assist him in all his various duties.³ In 1427 Leonardo Bruni was elected chancellor without Fortini's additional offices, but at that time provision was made for him to have two coadjutors instead of one.⁴ That was the first indication that the chancellor was being given assistance in his capacity as chancellor alone and it was carried further in 1437 with the division of the chancellery. For at that time the first chancellor was provided with one coadjutor and the second chancellor with two, so that five persons were now doing the work of three.⁵ That arrangement was continued until 1453 when the chancellorship was reunited. But that made little difference to the numbers of assistants employed, for now there was one principal coadjutor taking the place of the second chancellor in addition to three other coadjutors.⁶ However in 1457 when it appears that the chancellorship was again divided, the number of coadjutors was probably further increased. At that time Poggio seems to have been provided with a second chancellor and four coadjutors so that now six were doing the work of five. That was evidently considered to be a strain on the commune's finances, since it was recommended at the same time that two of the coadjutors be paid out of money set aside for the Studio.⁷ When Accolti was first elected he was provided with only one coadjutor, and therefore the

1. Ibid. pp. 155, 159.

2. Ibid. pp. 160-1.

3. Ibid. p. 183.

4. Cf. p. 80, note 4 above. It has not previously been known how many coadjutors were provided for when Bruni was elected.

5. Luiso, 'Riforma', pp. 136-8.

6. Ibid. pp. 139-41.

7. Cf. p. 70 above.

number of coadjutors was reduced to what it had been under Bruni and Marsuppini.¹ Each time Accolti was reelected chancellor provision was made for only one coadjutor; and it must have pleased the government that it was no longer necessary to employ additional coadjutors, especially considering that owing to his diligence Accolti was doing more as chancellor than any of his predecessors had done.

Accolti not only distinguished himself as chancellor by ably administering the foreign policy of the Signoria. When ambassadors from ultramontane states came to Florence, Accolti was called upon to answer on behalf of the Signoria, evidently because it would be necessary to respond in Latin. On one occasion, wrote Vespasiano da Bisticci, 'the ambassador of the King of Hungary, a most eloquent man, came and expounded his mission to the Signoria in Latin. Thereupon Messer Benedetto committed it to memory, wrote it out word for word in Latin, then translated it into the Volgare for the Signoria. Then having been called on by the Signoria to answer and having been told what to say, he composed his reply on the spot and delivered it in such a way that the ambassador, who was himself an extremely learned and eloquent man, was truly astonished. Messer Benedetto and the ambassador went out together, and when he praised Messer Benedetto for his feat, he repeated from memory the entire oration in Latin just as he had given it. According to what he told me the ambassador was absolutely amazed that Accolti repeated it entirely without leaving out a word, and he praised his intelligence and his memory, which he considered truly remarkable.' Because of ability in oratory, Accolti was anything but an embarrassment to the Signoria, such as Carlo Marsuppini had once been. Indeed, writing of his term as chancellor, Vespasiano said, 'Fu grandissimo ornamento a quello Palagio nel tempo che vi stette et per la grande memoria ch'egli aveva.'²

As chancellor Accolti naturally worked in close cooperation with the leading members of the regime. An in-

1. ASF, Balie, 29, fol. 60r.

2. Vespasiano, Vite, pp. 596-7.

sight into the way in which chancellery business must often have been conducted is provided by Accolti's only surviving private letter, which was addressed to Cosimo de' Medici (cf. Appendix III). Messer Bernardo Castiglionchio was the Captain of a galley which was being used for a crusading expedition of Pius II. He had left his galley in the care of one Pietro di Raimondo Manelli and had gone with the pope to the Congress of Mantua. In the meantime, Manelli allegedly began to commit acts of piracy with Bernardo's galley without his approval. Bernardo wanted to pursue Manelli to recover his galley and clear his name. It was rumoured that Manelli was nearing Provence with Bernardo's galley, and therefore Bernardo asked Accolti as chancellor to write to the lord of Provence. Accolti wrote the letter because he was told by Messer Otto Niccolini that Cosimo de' Medici approved of the idea. Messer Otto liked Accolti's letter: he thought that it was well written and made Bernardo appear innocent. Accolti then sent it to Cosimo, asking for his approval, in which case he asked Cosimo to return it the same day, as Bernardo wanted it immediately. The letter for Bernardo was written on 30 July 1459 and in its final form stated that Bernardo had nothing to do with Manelli's acts of piracy and asked the lord to grant him assistance in pursuing Manelli in his lands.

Accolti's work as chancellor was appreciated by the government. When he was first elected he received a salary of 300 florins a year for himself and one coadjutor; that was the salary that had been granted to the first chancellor since 1437. For at that time it had been ordered that Bruni should have a salary of 300 florins a year for himself and one coadjutor.¹ It seems that both Marsuppini before the chancellorship was reunited in 1453 and Poggio after it was again divided in 1457 received 300 florins; for in the Pratica of 27 December 1456 recommending that the chancellorship again be divided, it was suggested that 'messer poggio sia electo per cancelliere principale di

1. Luiso, 'Riforma', p. 137.

tempo in tempo con quello modo et salario che ebbe Messer Lionardo nel fine et Messer Carlo nel principio.¹ On the other hand, when there was only one chancellor, he received 600 florins a year. Thus in 1427 Bruni was given a salary of 600 florins a year for himself and two coadjutors;² after 31 January 1453 when the chancellorship was reunited Marsuppini was given 600 florins a year for himself and four coadjutors and the same was granted to Poggio in April 1453 when he was first elected.³ Therefore it had been customary to increase the first chancellor's salary only when he was made responsible for other offices. Nevertheless, on 7 October 1458 only six months after Accolti had assumed office, the Balìa ordered that his salary be increased from 300 to 450 florins. For they realized, it was stated, that Accolti, in his eagerness to serve the commune, had accepted the office although he had earned far more as a lawyer, and that he now looked to the goodwill of the government lest he should suffer any inconvenience. Therefore they considered it befitting the dignity of the Florentine people that Accolti should understand that the work he devoted to the chancellorship was appreciated and that he should benefit, not suffer as a result of his duties.⁴ Then five months later on 20 February 1459 it was approved in the Consiglio del Cento by 118 votes to 15 that, 'considering Accolti's virtues and desiring to retain him as chancellor,' he be reelected for another three years at his present salary of 450 florins a year.⁵ Evidently, however, 450 florins was not considered sufficient, for on 5 February 1460 a further rise was discussed in the Pratica. Introducing the subject, the Gonfaloniere of Justice,

1. ASF, CP, 54, fol. 79v; cf. Walser, Poggius, p. 406.

2. Cf. p. 80, note 4 above. It has not previously been known what Bruni's or Marsuppini's salaries were when they were first elected. Cf. Marzi, La cancelleria, pp. 190-1, 212-3.

3. Luiso, 'Riforma', pp. 139-41.

4. ASF, Balie, 29, fol. 60r.

5. ASF, Consiglio del Cento, 1, fol. 15r-15v; ibid. Libri Fabarum, 66, fol. 1r.

Piero di Cosimo de' Medici, said, 'the Signoria believe that something must be done about increasing the salary of Messer Benedetto, the chancellor, but they did not wish to come to a decision without the consent and advice of the Pratica.' Franco Ventura then said that 'it would be a pleasant undertaking to increase the salary of one who did such a good job, and money well spent was never wasted.' Manno Temperani said that 'there was a proverb that it was never a burden to pay a good pedlar or apprentice. Therefore since Accolti has served devotedly he thought the he should be rewarded accordingly and that his salary should be increased.' The next speaker, Domenico Martelli, was more extravagant in his praise of Accolti, saying, 'No one had ever been in that position who had. . .conducted himself more diligently. He left the practice of law which had been especially lucrative and therefore his salary ought to be increased.' Messer Otto Niccolini agreed with the previous speakers, mentioning that Accolti had given up the practice of law and suggested that his salary be increased by 100 florins. Giovanni Bartoli said that 'since all citizens have equally praised the chancellor it was just that his salary be increased; in that office he did the city more service than himself.' Saying that 'it was not possible to speak fittingly of the chancellor's excellence,' Franco Sacchetti agreed that his salary should be raised. Then Dietisalvi Neroni said that 'the chancellor was a truly excellent man and therefore his salary should not only be increased by 100 florins but by a far greater amount.' Luigi Guicciardini agreed with the others 'affirming that it greatly enhanced the honour of the city to have such a man exercise this office. And therefore his salary should be increased.' Bart^olomeo Lenzi exceeded all previous speakers in his praise of Accolti, saying that 'the office of chancellor has never been such as it is now and therefore it was very gratifying to increase his salary.' Vanni Rucellai said that 'each day his virtues became more apparent and just as good princes rewarded learned men, so must the commune provide for Accolti and therefore his salary should be increased.' Nicola Capponi was the first to

suggest that it be increased by 150 florins, and Bernardo Medici agreed with the others saying that such 'virtue and fidelity could not be purchased.' Luigi Guicciardini agreed with the previous speakers, adding that 'his learning deserved every reward and there was no satisfactory recompense for his merit.' Mariotto Benvenuti agreed saying that 'each day the good offices of the chancellor increased and therefore deserved reward.' Matteo Palmieri agreed with the others and Angelo della Stufa said that 'a reward could not be found that would befit the chancellor's virtues. It is customary to lead men to the pursuit of greater virtue by reward and therefore his salary should be increased in order that he be made better each day by the hope of reward.' Leonardo Bartolini agreed saying that 'Messer Benedetto deserved every kind of salary,' and Piero Pazzi said that 'it was not possible to praise the chancellor and grant him rewards without his deserving even greater ones.' Finally Antonio Pucci agreed saying that 'never in the city had there been a more illustrious chancellor than the present one and that therefore his salary should be increased.'¹ In view of these opinions, on 18 February 1461 the priors decided to increase his salary by 150 florins a year. On the following day the proposal was submitted to the Colleges where it was approved; then it was examined and approved by four of the Conservatori di Legge, Pazzino di Giovanni Cicciporci, Niccolò di Messer Giuliano Davanzati, Dietisalvi Neroni, and Ser Niccolò di Michele di Feo di Dino. In view of Accolti's singular virtues, it was stated in the provision submitted to the councils, and because he had earned more as a lawyer than he did as chancellor, and in order that he should benefit, not suffer as a result of his work for the Signoria, it was ordered that his salary be increased by 150 florins a year for himself and one notary.² On the first reading the bill was approved by the Consiglio del Popolo on 23 February 1461 by 152 votes to 58,³ on 25 February by the

1. Cf. Appendix IV.

2. ASF, Provvisioni, Registri, 151, fol. 367r-367v.

3. ASF, Libri Fabarum, 66, fol. 140v.

Consiglio del Comune by 126 votes to 33,¹ and on 27 February 1461 by 96 votes to 16 in the Consiglio del Cento.² Moreover, on the same day on which his new salary was approved by the Consiglio del Cento he was reelected by that council for three more years, although his previous term of office did not expire until 17 April 1462; it was from that date that his next term was to begin and the measure was approved by 97 votes to 15.³ Vespasiano da Bisticci not surprisingly wrote that he had 'heard from many of those members of the government who had frequented the Palace during Accolti's term that it had been a long time since there had been someone in the Palace who had conducted himself better than he or who had brought greater honour to it.'⁴

Accolti's career as chancellor was cut short by his death from dropsy on 25 September 1464.⁵ When he came to office he had found the chancellery in disorder as a result of Poggio's years of negligence, but in six years he was able to put the administration back on its feet and even to improve many official procedures. The Florentines themselves recognized him as one of their most capable officials, and must have keenly regretted his death at the age of forty-nine.

1. Ibid. fol. 142r.

2. Ibid. fol. 143v.

3. Ibid. fol. 145r; ASF, Consiglio del Cento, Registri, 1, fol. 39v-40r.

4. Vite, p. 597.

5. ASF, Medici e Speciali, 245, fol. 74v.

CHAPTER IV: ACCOLTI'S DIALOGUS DE PRESTANTIA
VIRORUM SUI EVI

It has been pointed out that the Florentine chancellor was expected to be a man of letters, and according to Vespasiano da Bisticci, Accolti 'cominciò in nel tempo ch'egli era in Palagio a comporre.'¹ During the 1440's Accolti had managed to write a few poems while practising and teaching law, but between 1450 and 1458, when he became chancellor, he seems to have written nothing. His successful legal practice in that period probably left him little time to pursue his literary interests; the opportunity to continue in his humanist studies may have been a compensation for the loss of income he suffered at first as chancellor.

The first work he undertook as chancellor was the Dialogus de prestantia virorum sui evi, dedicated to Cosimo de' Medici. The subject of the dialogue was the querelle of the ancients and moderns; in it he defended modern times against the attacks of an anonymous opponent. As his first major work he was anxious that it should be well received; in the dedicatory letter he explained that he hoped Cosimo's name would lend his book prestige. He had never before attempted a work of this kind, he continued, but was confident that Cosimo would judge it with charity. If his opinion was not entirely unfavourable, he would feel less hesitant about writing in the future.²

1. Vite, p. 597.

2. The presentation copy of the Dialogus is codex 54, 8 of the Biblioteca Laurenziana (cf. E. Piccolomini, Intorno alle condizioni ed alle vicende della Libreria Medicea Privata. Ricerche / Florence, 1875_, p. 92). Other manuscripts are:

(a) Bibl. Laur., Ashburnham 924 (formerly 855). Copy of a manuscript dated 1626 and presented by Leonardo and Pietro Accolti to Cardinal Francesco Barberini.

(b) Biblioteca Landau Finally, Codex 271. When the collection was sold, the codex did not go to the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence and I have been unable to trace its location. It is described by F. Roediger, in Catalogue des livres manuscrits et imprimés composant la bibliothèque de M. Horace de Landau. (Florence, 1885-90), vol. II, p. 137, who maintained

The Dialogus may be dated between December 1460 and November 1463: a terminus ante quem is provided by a reference in the past tense to Guarino Veronese, who died on 4 December 1460,¹ indicating that he was dead at the time Accolti was writing: 'An tibi videntur. . . Veronensis Guarinus. . . et alii multi, quos fere omnes vidimus, non supremi extitisse?'² A terminus post quem may be inferred from Accolti's mention of Cosimo de' Medici's 'filii', suggesting that Giovanni, who died in November, 1463, was still alive when Accolti was writing.³

Accolti placed particular emphasis in the Dialogus on the defense of contemporary christianity in comparison with the ancient church. He may have decided to write the Dialogue in answer to charges made against the modern church by his uncle, Antonio Roselli, in a poem, 'Quelli or' veggiam che si dirieno in sorte'.⁴ Roselli, one of the most prominent canonists of his day, served both Martin V and Eugenius IV in Rome. He was given various high dignities in the Curia; but eventually he quarrelled with

it was the presentation copy to Cardinal Barberini.
 (c) ASF, Carte Stroziane, ser. III, 102, fol. 252r.
 A passage of the Dialogue praising a member of the Strozzi family, copied out by Carlo Strozzi, from a manuscript deriving from the one dedicated to Barberini. The latter three manuscripts date the Dialogue in 1440. The presentation copy is not dated, and there is no evidence in Leonardo Accolti's Diary (BCA, Codex 34) that he owned the autograph or a manuscript deriving from it. Moreover, that date is contradicted by internal evidence; perhaps Leonardo Accolti was guessing at the date. The Dialogue has most recently been published by G. Galletti, in F. Villani, Liber de civitatis Florentiae famosis civibus (Florence, 1847), pp. 105-28.

The dedicatory letter is found in Bibl. Laur, Codex 54, 8, fol. 1r-2v (Galletti, p. 105).

1. R. Sabbadini, 'Guarino Veronese', Enciclopedia italiana (Milan, 1933), vol. XI, p. 27.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 41r (Galletti, p. 122).

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 35v (Galletti, p. 119).

4. Published in A. Lumini, Scritti letterari, ser. 1^a (Arezzo, 1884), pp. 159-163. On the attribution of the poem to Antonio Roselli, cf. Flamini, La lirica toscana, pp. 724-5.

Eugenius IV and in 1438 he moved to Padua, where he was employed in the Studio for the rest of his life. In the aftermath of his dispute with the pope, he wrote a treatise, Monarchia, in which he attacked papal claims to temporal power as compared with the emperor's.¹ It was probably at the same time that he wrote his vehemently anti-clerical and anti-papal poem, 'Quelli or' veggiam'.

Accolti's adversary in the Dialogus is anonymous, and it was unusual for disputants in humanist dialogues to go unnamed. If the opponent Accolti had in mind were in fact his uncle, Antonio Roselli, his reticence would be explained: for he might well have wished to avoid turning a sober humanist dialogue into the forum for a family disagreement. Another reason for identifying Accolti's opponent with his uncle is the similarity of the arguments they used to denounce the modern church. Both contrast the purity of the ancient with the corruption of the modern church; both distinguish two periods in Christian history and see the dividing line not as the birth of Christ but rather the end of antiquity; both maintain that in the modern church appointments go to unworthy candidates, to the neglect of virtuous men; both argue that the modern clergy misgoverns Christendom and leads the people along the path of sin; both contrast the princes of the modern church, attended by pomp and luxury, with the saints of antiquity, who suffered martyrdom and persecution.² A third reason for identifying Accolti's adversary as his uncle is their unusual point of view. The basis of their argument is that in antiquity there were countless saints, martyrs, and miracles, but now only corruption and degeneracy are evident. The novelty of their position consists in the point at which they divide the period of the ancient church from that of the modern: not at the birth of Christ, but at the end of antiquity. They contrast the age of the primitive church with that of the modern church. In an-

1. On Roselli's life, cf. BCA, Codex 55, fol. 266r-267v.

2. Cf. Lumini, Scritti letterari, pp. 159-63 and Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 10r-14v (Galletti, pp. 108-10).

swering his opponent's charge, Accolti uses the same scheme. In the modern age, he says, Christianity has finally prevailed; if the ancient church was honoured by more saints, it was at the same time disgraced by more heretics. Riches and luxury are needed by the modern clergy to inspire the populace with awe; if there are fewer miracles today, that is because there is less disbelief to render them necessary; if there are fewer martyrs, there is less persecution.¹

In medieval religious literature, admittedly, modern corruption was frequently contrasted with ancient purity; reformers held up the model of the early Apostolic church as a standard from which their contemporaries had fallen. Often they considered the church to have been corrupted by the Donation of Constantine; the contrast between primitive asceticism and modern degeneracy was at the root of the call for apostolic poverty in the middle ages.² Two examples are Wyclif and Huss, both of whom contrasted the corrupt papacy, devoid of legitimate claim to be head of the church, with Christ and the Apostles.³ What distinguishes the writings in this tradition from Accolti's Dialogue is that the contrast presented in them was not conceived of in terms of two historical periods. It was not stated that the ages themselves of the early and modern church were different; criticism was made by comparison of individuals, for example, Boniface VIII with St Peter or the modern cardinals with the Apostles.

In early humanist literature, the traditional point of view, based on the comparison of individuals, was more common than Roselli's and Accolti's.⁴ A famous instance is Lorenzo Valla's De Constantini donatione, in which Pope Sylvester I is cited as an example of Christian sim-

1. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 45v-53r (Galletti, pp. 123-7).

2. Cf. G. Leff, Heresy in the Later Middle Ages. The relation of heterodoxy to dissent c. 1250-c. 1450. (Manchester, 1967), 2 vols, pp. 8-9, 51-255, 411-707 passim.

3. Ibid. pp. 536 seq., 665 seq.

4. Cf. E. Garin, 'Desideri di riforma nell'oratoria del Quattrocento,' in La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano. Ricerche e documenti. (Florence, 1961), pp. 166-182.

plicity in contrast to Eugenius IV, but in which no explicit mention is made of the differences between Sylvester's period and the modern age.¹ Related are comparisons made by the humanists between the bad style of the scholastics and the eloquence of the Fathers.² But they rarely discussed the history of religion in the same way that Accolti and his uncle did, because they were usually side-tracked by the dispute between paganism and Christianity. Paganism was the most obvious difference between antiquity and modern times. The birth of Christ became the point at which ancient and modern religion were divided.³

The only previous humanists to distinguish between the ancient and modern ages of the church were Coluccio Salutati and Lapo da Castiglionchio. In the chapter on poverty in De seculo et religione, Salutati argued that the city of God flourished under poverty but was corrupted by riches. Christians for the first three hundred years were paupers, he maintained, but by virtue of their sanctity they spread the faith throughout the world. Since the Donation of Constantine, the church had become enriched with temporal goods, but spiritually impoverished, too weak to combat the Saracens and the schismatic Greeks; now it was even torn apart by internal schism.⁴ Salutati's argument resembles that of Accolti's adversary in the Dialogue, like whom he sees the turning point in Christian history in late antiquity. A similar division of Christian history is found in Lapo da Castiglionchio's Dialogus super excellentia curie Romane, where it is argued, as in Accolti's Dialogue, that although poverty suited

1. Ed. W. Schwahn (Leipzig, 1928) passim. Cf. Hanna H. Gray, 'Valla's Encomium of St Thomas Aquinas and the Humanist Conception of Christian Antiquity,' in Essays in History and Literature presented . . . to Stanley Pargellis, ed. H. Bluhm (Chicago, 1965), pp. 40-2.

2. Cf. ibid. pp. 37 seq.; L. Bruni, De studiis et litteris liber in Humanistisch-philosophische Schriften, ed. H. Baron (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 5-19.

3. Cf. Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 295-314.

4. Ed. B. L. Ullman (Florence, 1957), pp. 128-31.

the early church, wealth befits the modern church.¹ Christ had to be poor, Lapo maintains, in order to convince the world of his divinity; for in that age of wealth, a rich man would have gone unnoticed and worldly goods were despised by holy men. Christ had to confute extremely learned men; reason and argument were insufficient, so that he had to resort to miracles, which must have seemed all the more divinely inspired, since they were called forth by a man without background or position. But all periods in history are not the same. The church, now that it is established, requires wealth. For this is an age which admires riches and despises poverty: how ridiculous it would seem to have the pope ride a donkey!² Salutati, Lapo, Roselli, and Accolti divide Christian history into two distinct ages; Roselli and Salutati, Accolti and Lapo offer similar arguments. Accolti may have known Salutati's work, which survives in many manuscripts³ and he may have known Lapo personally, for both belonged to Bruni's circle in Florence in the late 1430's.⁴ It is possible therefore that Accolti was acquainted with their ideas on clerical poverty at the time he was writing his Dialogue. Neither of these works, however, can convincingly be cited as the direct source for the arguments put forward by Accolti's opponent in the Dialogue. Lapo's discussion of clerical wealth may be eliminated on the obvious grounds that his argument is the opposite of Accolti's adversary's. Salutati may be dismissed as the opponent Accolti had in mind because it is hard to see what motive Accolti would have had to suppress Salutati's name. Therefore, the evidence suggests that it was Antonio

1. Ed. R. Scholz, in Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XVI (1914), pp. 116-53.

2. Ibid. pp. 148-50.

3. Cf. De seculo, pp. vi-xvi.

4. Cf. H. Baron, 'Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth,' Speculum, XIII (1938), pp. 29-30; F.P. Luiso, 'Studi su l'epistolario e le traduzioni di Lapo da Castiglione junior,' Studi italiani di filologia classica, VII (1899), pp. 234-6, 242-5, 248-51, 259; E. Garin, Prosatori latini del Quattrocento (Milan, 1952), p. 169; Vespasiano, Vite, p. 582.

Roselli's poem 'Quelli or' veggiam' in particular which inspired Accolti's criticisms in the Dialogue.¹

It is not difficult to understand why the humanists should have developed so novel a view of Christian history. One significant influence was epideictic rhetoric, the genre to which a great many humanist works, including Accolti's Dialogue, belonged; for a common way to praise or blame an individual is to associate him with the age in which he lives. Dante for example might be praised for having written works that were in advance of his times. Humanists saw ages and periods in everything, because it was a fundamental way of praising or blaming. Accolti thus praised modern religion by saying that in his day miracles were no longer necessary and blamed ancient religion by pointing out that in antiquity there were more martyrs because there was more persecution. In medieval literature ages were mentioned;² but they did not assume the same importance as they held for the humanists. The humanists' point of view rested on the contrast between ages, between modern times and antiquity. It was because of the contrast they sensed between their own age and antiquity that they wished to revive ancient language and culture.³

Another influence which shaped the new humanist scheme of Christian history was their concept of antiquity. From ancient times there had never been agreement over when antiquity was or who the ancients were: in E. R. Curtius' words, 'from century to century, the line of demarcation shifts.'⁴ 'A writer who dropped off a hundred years ago,'

1. If the poem were in fact by Accolti's brother, Francesco, to whom it is attributed by one manuscript (cf. Flamini, La lirica toscana, pp. 724-5), the above argument would not be affected. For Benedetto would have had the same motive for concealing his brother's name as his uncle's.

2. Cf. for example, Walter Map, De nugis curialium, ed. M. R. James (Oxford, 1914), p. 59.

3. Cf. M. Baxandall, Giotto and the Orators. Humanist observers of painting in Italy and the discovery of pictorial composition, 1350-1450 (Oxford, 1971), p. 59.

4. E. R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (New York, 1953), p. 253; cf. ibid. pp. 251-5 for a full discussion of the ancients and moderns in antiquity and the middle ages.

wrote Horace, for example, 'is he to be reckoned among the perfect and ancient, or among the worthless and modern? Let some limit banish disputes. "He is ancient," you say, "and good, who completes a hundred years." "What of one who passed away a month or a year short of that, in what class is he to be reckoned? The ancient poets, or those whom today and tomorrow must treat with scorn?" He surely will find a place of honour among the ancients, who is short by a brief month or even a year. I take what you allow, and like hairs in a horse's tail, first one and then another I pluck and pull away little by little. . . .'¹ In the middle ages there was a similar lack of definition: the twelfth-century Byzantine scholar Eustathius referred to recent writers as οἱ παλαιοί and Walter Map, in his De nugis curialium, said, 'Nostra dico tempora modernitatem hanc, horum scilicet centum annorum curriculum.'² Dante called the contemporaries of Cacciaguida 'antichi' (Par. XVI, 91) in contrast to 'la cittadinanza, ch'è or mista.' (Ibid. 49) In the early Renaissance, Filippo Villani, contrasting the 'saeculi praesentis ignominiam' with 'antiquorum virtutes,' still meant by the 'antiqui' the contemporaries of Dante, 'nostri Poetae. . . .Concives multi.'³ But by Accolti's time antiquity was no longer thought to change with every generation; the ancients, once and for all, had become, in Accolti's words, 'qui vel apud Grecos et Macedones quondam, vel apud Penos, Romanosque, vigente republica, vel parum post ea sub Romanis principibus floruerunt.'⁴ Modern times, nostra etas began somewhere between 600 and 800 A. D. For Filippo Villani, Dante was an 'antiquus', but for Erasmus, Thomas Aquinas was a 'neotericus', a modern.⁵ Therefore, the two ages into which Roselli, Accolti, Salutati

1. Horace, Ep. II, 1, 34-46, tr. H. R. Fairclough (London, 1970) in the Loeb Classical Library.

2. Curtius, European Literature, pp. 252, 255.

3. F. Villani, De origine civitatis Florentiae, in Galletti, p. 5.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 3v (Galletti, p. 106).

5. Quoted in Curtius, European Literature, p. 251.

and Lapo divided the history of the church were the same periods that the humanists used to divide the rest of world history. Their point of view depended on an antiquity which did not change from one generation to the next; they simply applied their scheme for apportioning the periods of universal history to the history of religion. Medieval writers failed to regard Christian history from this point of view, because for them antiquity was always changing.

The germinal idea of Accolti's Dialogue was a provocative one. In the field of Christian historiography the Quattrocento humanists made an original contribution, which would prove especially influential in the period of Erasmus and the Reformation. Rhetoric, it has been observed, was a significant influence in shaping the humanist view of Christian history. But it was just as much, if not perhaps more, a force inhibiting the humanists from developing their ideas. The difference between the fifteenth-century humanists and the sixteenth century Erasmians is that, for Roselli or Salutati, the comparison between the ancient and modern churches was a rhetorical one: the Quattrocento humanists were not church reformers. Forces outside the humanist movement were required to turn the new vision of Christian history into a programme for the renewal of the church. Rhetoric also limited Accolti's possibilities of developing interesting ideas in the rest of the Dialogue. For the conventions of epideictic rhetoric set the terms of the debate.

The Dialogue has many signs of being a rhetorical exercise. Students of rhetoric were told to write orations supporting both sides of a dispute,¹ and rhetoricians prided themselves on their ability to argue the merits of any proposition, even one they did not accept.² Accolti's attempt to take both sides of a dispute largely determined

1. Cf. Cicero, *Orator*, 46; Diog. Laertes IV, 28; Cicero, *De oratore*, I, 158: "disputandumque de omni re in contrarias partes."

2. Plato, *Phaedrus*, 267A; Aristotle, *Rhet.* II, 24, 11; Diog. Laertes IX, 53; Cicero, *Brutus*, 46; *id.* *De oratore*, I, 44; Quintilian, II, xvii, 21.

the tone of the Dialogue: he had to put extreme and opposing opinions into the mouths of his interlocutors. For example, his adversary says that in antiquity armies were models of discipline, whereas today they are corrupt:

'Illi item (ancient soldiers) semper in armis, in laboribus variis, continuo corpus exercebant, nunquam otiosii; nostri vero maxima temporis parte in delitiis et conviviis, inter scorta et libidines ebrietates versantur, nullo imperio, nulla disciplina coerciti.' (italics mine) In answer Accolti says, 'At si tu veterum historias diligentius perquires, invenies creberrimas. . . militum prodiciones ac perfidias; que si enumerare pergam, grandis voluminis liber non sufficeret, et longior quam proposuerim fieret oratio.'¹ (italics mine) Accolti's language is hyperbolic and his adversary's claims are absolute; such extreme statements characterize the discourse of the Dialogue.

It has been pointed out that as a work of rhetoric the Dialogue belongs to the genus of epideixis, the rhetoric of praise or blame.² In his speech Accolti's adversary praises antiquity and vilifies modern times, whereas Accolti does the opposite. In epideictic rhetoric neutral statements, ones not implying value judgments, have no place. A typical passage of the Dialogue is Accolti's comparison of ancient and modern morals: 'Non dies solum sed annus me deficeret, si velim referre immensa eorum temporum (antiquity) avaritie scelera, rapinas, fenora, falsas confictas fabulas, propinquorum mortes, ut eorum bona caperentur, iudiciorum corruptelas, bonas oppressiones et calumnias, gulam immensam, ludos scenicos, et alios multos turpissimos, gladiatorias pugnas, proscriptiones optimorum civium, infinitos viros optimos falsis iudiciis

1. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 9r, 26v (Galetti, pp. 108, 115).

2. Cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, III, 10-15; Cicero, De inventione, II, 177-8; id. De part. orator., 70-82; id. De oratore, II, 340-9; Quintilian, III, vii. Cf. M. L. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome. A historical survey (London, 1953), pp. 15, 32, 39, 53, 111, 131, 132 seq., 140 seq.; Curtius, European Literature, pp. 68-9, 154-182; Baxandall, Giotto, pp. 45-6; T. C. Burgess, 'Epideictic Literature,' Studies in Classical Philology, III (1902), pp. 89-261.

oppressos. . . Quorum multo quamvis hoc tempore non desint, tamen dicere audeo, nec palam, ut olim, nec tam crebro a multis ea solere usurpari; et esse populos multos, quibus illa horrori sint, et omnes fere, quibus Christi placet religio, timidiores ad nocendum factos.'¹ Phrases expressing value judgments have been underlined, and it will be seen that they set the tone of the passage.

Epideictic oratory is concerned with delineating quality, with distinguishing good from bad. One way was to show that a phenomenon was the result or effect of another laudable or deplorable phenomenon,² such as when Accolti criticizes Roman oratory by saying that it ceased to flourish under the Principate when liberty was lost.³ Another was ekphrasis or descriptio: some object or phenomenon was provided with a detailed description.⁴ Accolti, for example, praises modern military discipline by giving a point by point account of contemporary military practice.⁵ A third way was by means of comparison,⁶ such as when both Accolti and his opponent contrast antiquity with modern times. A special version of this technique was to point out that something was unusual or unique: thus Accolti praised Venice and Florence for maintaining their liberty, although other towns had lost theirs by internal strife.⁷

There were standard arguments or commonplaces (loci communes) that rhetoricians used in their works. One

1. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 54v-55r (Galletti, p. 127).

2. Baxandall, Giotto, pp. 45-6.

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 39v-40r (Galletti, p. 121).

4. Cf. Baxandall, Giotto, p. 85; Curtius, European Literature, pp. 69, 194.

5. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 24r-25r (Galletti, pp. 114-5).

6. Baxandall, Giotto, pp. 45-6. Cf. De oratore, II, 348: Est etiam cum ceteris praestantibus viris comparatio in laudatione praeclara; Quintilian, II, iv, 21.

7. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 28v (Galletti, p. 116).

such commonplace is Accolti's adversary's denunciation of his own times. Horace, for example, in his Ode 'Delicta maiorum immerita lues' denounces the Romans as impious, factious and morally degenerate; similar were passages of Vergil's Eighth Eclogue (vv. 53 seq.) or Juvenal's satires (especially II, VI, and XI). It remained a favourite theme in the middle ages,¹ and became one of the clichés of Renaissance literature. Such were Petrarch's many condemnations of his own age,² Salutati's denunciation of the modern church in De seculo et religione,³ Filippo Villani's criticisms of his contemporaries in De origine civitatis Florentiae,⁴ Niccolò Niccoli's attacks on the modern age in Bruni's Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus,⁵ and Poggio's criticism of modern princes in a letter to Alfonso of Aragon in 1444.⁶

The myth of the Golden Age was often taken up by writers in their praise of antiquity. Horace in the above-mentioned ode, after blaming his contemporaries, recalls the deeds of the early Romans and the severity of their lives. Similar were parts of Vergil's Georgics, in which modern corruption was compared with the simplicity of old Rome (II, vv. 458-540); or passages by Juvenal, who contrasts the old Rome with the new in which gluttony, feminine affectation and Greek decadence prevail (III, vv. 29-40, 60-181, 312-24; VI, vv. 1-20; XI, vv. 64-146).⁷ It was a commonplace in medieval European literature,⁸ and became

1. Curtius, European Literature, pp. 97-8.

2. Cf. 6th and 7th Eclogues; Ep. sine nomine, 11, 17; Ep. Famil. XIX, 9 and XXII, 14; Ep. senil. VII, 1.

3. Cf. p. 124 above.

4. Galletti, p. 5.

5. Ed. Garin, Prosatori latini, pp. 52-74.

6. Poggio, Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 298-9. Cf. id. De infelicitate principum dialogus, in Opera omnia (Basel, 1538).

7. For more references, cf. C. Davis, 'Il buon tempo antico', in Florentine Studies. Politics and society in Renaissance Florence, ed. N. Rubinstein (London, 1968), p. 65.

8. Curtius, European Literature, pp. 94-8.

a favourite theme of writers in the Italian communes. Belonging to this rhetorical tradition was the idea of the good old days, 'il buon tempo antico,' which became a special favourite in Florence.¹ This use of the myth of the Golden Age remained a commonplace in Renaissance literature: such were Filippo Villani's criticisms of his own age and his idealization of the age of Dante,² Niccoli's devotion to classical antiquity in Book I of Bruni's Dialogue,³ or Bruni's own reference to men of the present day as homunculi in comparison with the ancients.⁴ In the preface of his translation of Plutarch's life of Quintus Sertorius, Bruni said that the military feats of modern times, in comparison with antiquity, were like 'puerilia quaedam ludicra. . . , expertia ordinis, expertia disciplinae, expertia scientiae rei militaris, nunquam collatis signis dimicare ausa, sed levibus certaminibus fugisque et insectationibus instar puerorum contenta. . . nec in re militari nec in gubernatione rerum publicarum nec in eloquentia nec in studiis bonarum artium tempora nostra antiquis respondere.'⁵ Similar was the contrast drawn between antiquity and modern times by Accolti's adversary in the Dialogue:

in regenda domi Respublica. . . temporibus illis (antiquity) multa clari viri evasere. . . Quid de veteribus philosophis, oratoribus, iureconsultis, poetis et mathematicis dicam? quorum. . . fuit. . . tam admirabilis doctrina, ut nullo modo superari posse videantur, nec quisquam postea repertus est, qui tales viros etiam longo intervallo valeret imitari. . . Nec certe se melius nunc disciplina militaris habet; nulla in ducibus bellorum peritia. . . reperitur. . . Nullus in eorum castris ordo. . . viget. . . et nulla alia re, nisi timiditate insignes, ita se armis tegunt ut nullum in acie, nisi lassitudinis periculum subeant.⁶

1. Davis, 'Il buon tempo antico', pp. 45-69.

2. Galletti, p. 5.

3. Prosatori latini, pp. 52-74.

4. Epistolae, vol. I, p. 28.

5. Bruni, Schriften, pp. 124-5.

6. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 4r-9v (Galletti, pp. 106-8).

Accolti's own position, like his opponent's, was a rhetorical commonplace. Ovid contrasted the crude manners of ancient Rome with the polish of his own day.¹ Other ancient poets said that contemporary villas and festivals, battles and military leaders were greater and better than ancient ones. John of Salisbury claimed that Thomas à Becket was more intelligent than Plato, and Wido of Amiens (d. 1076) compared William the Conqueror's victory over King Harold to Julius Caesar's over Pompey.² It remained a banality in the Renaissance: Petrarch said that his law professors at Bologna resembled the ancient legislators³ and that Cola di Rienzo was like the two Bruti;⁴ Filippo Villani preferred Giotto to ancient artists, Pagolo de' Dagomani to ancient astronomers, and Gonnella to ancient buffoons;⁵ Matteo Palmieri compared the burgeoning of the arts in Florence to that of Greece and Rome⁶ and Giannozzo Manetti said that Brunelleschi's dome rivalled the pyramids;⁷ Poggio said that Alfonso of Aragon was a greater prince than Augustus, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius or the Antonines;⁸ and Flavio Biondo said that the papal empire was as great as that of ancient Rome.⁹

An orator, said Protagoras, can make the weaker cause

1. Ars amoris, III, 114 seq.

2. Curtius, European Literature, pp. 162-5; another version of the topos was to ridicule the notion that age confers value: cf. Horace, Epist. II, 1, 18 seq.; Curtius, European Literature, pp. 98, 165-6.

3. Ep. senil. X, 2.

4. Ep. var. 48.

5. Cf. Baxandall, Giotto, pp. 70-2.

6. Della vita civile, ed. F. Battaglia (Bologna, 1944), pp. 36 seq. Cf. H. Baron, 'The Querelle of the Ancients and the Moderns as a Problem for Renaissance Scholarship', Journal of the History of Ideas, XX (1959), p. 18.

7. Ibid.

8. Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 305-6.

9. Scritti inediti e rari di Biondo Flavio, ed. B. Nogara, in Studi e Testi, XLVIII (1927), pp. xci-ci.

seem the stronger¹ and such power was often attributed to rhetoric by later writers.² Accolti was perhaps trying to demonstrate the truth of that claim when in his Dialogue he favourably compared modern with ancient oratory;³ his argument, indeed, adhered closely to the precepts of rhetoric, having been constructed entirely out of commonplaces. He knew that oratory was an art in which the Greeks and Romans had above all excelled,⁴ and he begins by showing how their proficiency was the result of fortunate circumstances. Here he uses a favourite topos of antiquity: an art flourishes so long as it is held in esteem, or as Cicero said, 'honos alit artes.'⁵ Since oratory, continues Accolti, was honoured and in constant use in antiquity, it is no wonder that it flourished. This argument is an apology for modern times: since rhetoric is no longer put to practical use, modern orators cannot be expected to equal the ancients. But having turned historical circumstances into an excuse for modern times, he goes on to criticize antiquity. In the first point of this censure of antiquity he says that the Romans were not the equals of the Greeks; for orators played a greater role in political life at Athens than at Rome.⁶ Here Accolti is making use of two commonplaces of ancient rhetoric: that the Greeks, especially the Athenians, excelled in rhetoric and were ruled by orators;⁷ and that in learning the Romans were

1. Plato, Phaedrus, 267A.

2. Aristotle, Rhet. II, 24, 11; Diogenes Laertes IX, 53; Cicero, Brutus, 47.

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 38r-41r (Galletti, pp. 120-1).

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 38r-38v (Galletti, p. 120): Concedo itaque forense dicendi genus apud veteres Grecos Latinosque. . . oratorum numero et ipsius orationis copia, suavitate ornatuque verborum, precipue tunc excelluisse.

5. Disp. Tusc. I, 4, quoted by Accolti, Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 38v (Galletti, p. 120); for this topos applied specifically to oratory, cf. Cicero, Brutus, 40, 51, 182.

6. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 38v (Galletti, pp. 120-1).

7. Cf. Cicero, Brutus, 26-9, 44; id. De oratore, I, 13; Quintilian, X, 1, 76-80; Cicero, Opt. Gen. Or., 7-13.

inferior to the Greeks.¹ In the second part of his censure of antiquity, Accolti goes on to say that rhetoric at Rome only began to be practised with Cato the Censor (234-139 B.C.), and even afterwards there were few great orators. Cato was often cited in Roman literature as an example of one of the first orators² and it was a commonplace to point out how few great orators there were.³ In his third argument against antiquity, Accolti says that oratory at Rome ceased to flourish under the Empire, for, with all power in the hands of one man, the art of persuasion was no longer needed or esteemed.⁴ Here Accolti cites the elder Seneca's opinion⁵ and there were many others who said that oratory was in decline during and after the collapse of the Republic.⁶ Accolti's argument that decline was due to political conditions was also a common one in antiquity. Cicero, for example, said that monarchy was inimical to oratory (Brutus, 45) and that oratory generally flourished among free peoples (De oratore, I, 30).⁷ In humanist li-

1. Cf. Disp. Tusc. I, 1-6; II, 1-9; IV, 1-7. Cf. also Horace, Epist. II, 1, 90-117.

2. Cicero, Brutus, 61; Quintilian, III, i, 19; Cicero, De oratore, I, 171 and III, 135; id. Disp. Tusc. I, 5.

3. Cicero, Brutus, 137-8, 182, 333; id. De oratore, I, 6-18.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 39v-40r (Galletti, p. 121).

5. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 40r (Galletti, p. 121). Cf. Controversiae, Praef. 7.

6. Petronius, Satyricon, 1-4; Seneca, Ep. 114; Pliny, Ep. II, 14; Quintilian, II, x, 3-5; id. V, xii, 17-23; Cicero, Brutus, 6-9, 22-3; id. Disp. Tusc. II, 5. Cf. Clarke, Rhetoric at Rome, pp. 100-8; H. Caplan, 'The Decay of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century,' Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond (Ithaca, New York, 1944), pp. 295-325 (reprinted in H. Caplan, Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Mediaeval Rhetoric, ed. A. King and H. North / Ithaca and London, 1970 /, pp. 160-95); E. Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa (Leipzig, 1898), vol. I, pp. 245-8; R. Syme, Tacitus (Oxford, 1958), vol. I, pp. 100-11; C.D.N. Costa, 'The Dialogus', in Tacitus, ed. T. A. Dorey (London, 1969), pp. 19-34.

7. Cf. also Brutus, 6-9, 22-3, 46. It is unnecessary to suppose that Accolti knew Tacitus' Dialogus, which only became known in Italy in 1455 (Cf. Sabbadini, Le scoperte, vol. II, p. 254) and in which the same argument is found.

terature the topos that the cultural decline of Rome was due to this rise of the Principate was a favourite: such for example was the argument used by Leonardo Bruni to censure the Empire.¹ Having criticized ancient oratory in these three arguments, Accolti turns to the praise of modern rhetoric and points to the great eloquence of many of his contemporaries.² The revival of letters was a favourite theme of the humanists, and in it they found, like Accolti, a useful way to praise their contemporaries.³ In his discussion of ancient and modern oratory, therefore, Accolti demonstrated his skill in constructing rhetorical arguments: using only the commonplaces, he managed to find much to praise in the moderns and blame in the ancients.

Another weak cause that Accolti tried to defend was contemporary military practice. It was weak, first of all, because in antiquity and the middle ages most authorities treating of military organization preferred a militia composed of citizens to a mercenary army,⁴ and, secondly, because contemporary military practice became a stock subject of ridicule for the humanists.⁵ But authorities condemning ancient military practices could be found, and some of the humanists, when the occasion was suitable, argued that mercenaries were superior to militiae. For example, Stefano Porcari, praising the Florentine Signoria for its prudent military policy, and Giannozzo Manetti, consigning the bastone to a condottiere, both argued that by employing mercenary armies, the youth of the state were

The περὶ ὑψους (apocryphal Longinus), 44, has the same argument, but it was probably not known until the later fifteenth century: Cf. 'Longinus' On the Sublime, ed. D. A. Russell (Oxford, 1964), p. xliii.

1. Cf. Bruni, Historiae, ed. Santini, pp. 14-5.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 40v-41r (Galletti, pp. 121-2).

3. Cf. for example, Palmieri, Della vita civile, p. 37.

4. The most important texts are summarized in C. C. Bailey, War and Society in Renaissance Florence (Toronto, 1961), pp. 178-84.

5. Ibid. pp. 184-231.

not put to risk on the battlefield.¹ As an aspect of contemporary life the mercenary system had to be defended in Accolti's Dialogue and Accolti uses many of the same arguments as other humanists faced with the same task. Different customs, he says, may be equally praiseworthy; the same practice is not suited to all times and places. All the arts admit of different types of excellence, not least the art of war; the ancients themselves used different forms of military organization.² Accolti borrowed this argument from Cicero's De oratore, III, 25 seq. where it was applied to sense perceptions as well as to painting, sculpture, poetry, and oratory.³ It was taken up by the humanists and is found in Manetti's speech, in Giovan Antonio Campano's Life of Braccio, and in Lodrisio Crivelli's Life of Muzio Attendolo.⁴ Another argument of Accolti's is that the moderns excel in the subtler arts of war, in trickery and deceit. This claim was based on a statement attributed by Livy to Hannibal that the Romans were blind to the fine points of warfare,⁵ and, like Accolti, Campano regarded the moderns' proficiency in these as a reason for their superiority over the ancients.⁶ Accolti found ancient military discipline lacking and he would have been able to cite the support of ancient authority.⁷ Campano formed

1. Stefano Porcari, 'Orazioni' in Testi di lingua tratti da' codici della Biblioteca Vaticana, ed. G. Manzi (Rome, 1816), pp. 23-7 and G. Manetti and Bernardo de' Medici, 'Orazione. . . quando e' dierono. . . il bastone a Gismondo. . . Malatesta,' in Commentario della vita di G. Manetti, scritto da Vespasiano da Bisticci, ed. P. Fanfani, in Collezione di opere inedite o rare, vol. II (Bologna, 1862), p. 209.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 23r-24r (Galletti, p. 114).

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 23r-24r (Galletti, p. 114). Cf. Brutus, 204 and 285.

4. Manetti and Medici, 'Orazione', p. 204; G. A. Campano, Braccii Perusini vita et gesta, ed. R. Valentini, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XIX, part IV (Bologna, n.d.), p. 168; L. Crivelli, De vita et rebus gestis Sfortiae. . . Historia, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, vol. XIX (Milan, 1731), col. 635, 639.

5. XXI, 54, 3, paraphrased by Accolti, in Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 25r (Galletti, p. 115).

6. Campano, pp. 165-7.

7. He quotes Lucan X 407-8 in Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8

the same judgment¹ and like Accolti² he praises contemporary military discipline in contrast.³ Another argument that Accolti shares with other humanists is that in siege warfare contemporaries, especially because of the invention of the cannon, are superior to the ancients;⁴ and like Accolti other humanists argue that ancient cavalry warfare is surpassed by modern, especially because of advances in armour.⁵ In one argument Accolti ventured beyond commonplaces: if mercenaries today are perfidious and disloyal, that is a question of moral, not military, degeneracy.⁶ It is not hard to see why such a specious argument failed to become a commonplace, for Accolti is simply begging the question.⁷

1. Campano, pp. 166-8.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 26v-27v (Galletti, pp. 115-6).

3. Campano, pp. 166-8.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 25r (Galletti, p. 115); F. Biondo, Historiarum ab inclinatio Romano imperio decades III (Basel, 1531), p. 294; Crivelli, col. 711; Campano, p. 167.

5. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 25r-25v; Crivelli, col. 635; Campano, pp. 166, 168.

6. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 26v (Galletti, p. 115).

7. Accolti's discussion of military customs has been interpreted by Bayley, War and Society, pp. 227-8 and Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 435-7, as the result of specific historical circumstances, rather than as a series of rhetorical topoi. Bayley argues that Cosimo de' Medici found 'literary assaults. . . on the condottieri . . . distasteful' and that 'the idolators of antiquity had steadily maintained that literary and military greatness could be achieved only in a free republic'; Accolti's defence of mercenaries was for Cosimo's benefit, showing that Florence, although no longer a free city, could still excel in arms. Bayley gives no evidence that Cosimo disliked condemnations of condottieri; on the other hand, even the condottieri themselves seemed not to mind what was said about them, as Roberto Valturio presented his De re militari, which supported the militia, to Sigismondo Malatesta. Nor was it 'steadily' argued that military excellence and liberty went hand in hand. Biondo, one of the most important critics of mercenaries, pointed out that the Empire grew under many of the Caesars (Decades, p. 4). Baron argues that Accolti's opinions show that 'republicanism and civic Humanism were waning in Florence,' and that 'the age of

Among the modern men whom Accolti considered equals of the ancients were Dante and Petrarch; writers were a favourite class of moderns to compare with the ancients. Pliny the Younger said a contemporary of his, Vergilius Romanus, had written comedies that 'inter Plautianas Terentianasque numeros';¹ Statius said Lucan surpassed Vergil, Ennius and Lucretius, and Ausonius said a contemporary's poems were better than Simonides'. In the middle ages, Walafrid Strabo (c. 809-49) said that a certain Probus was a better poet than Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Ausonius, Prudentius, Boethius and Arator.² In Italy during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Dante and Petrarch were often praised in this way. About 1330, an early commentator on Dante, Fra Guido da Pisa said that Dante 'antiquos poetas in mentibus nostris reminiscere fecit';³ Boccaccio and Giannozzo Manetti compared the prestige Dante won for the Volgare with Vergil's and Homer's effect on Latin and Greek;⁴ Filippo Villani said that Petrarch's style was as good, if not better than the ancients' and that his moral treatises were equal to theirs;⁵ Salutati claimed Petrarch was greater

Lorenzo de' Medici was opening'. In antiquity, and the middle ages, however, it was a commonplace to praise a civic militia and blame mercenaries. It was not very interesting nor original, when Bruni, Palmieri, Landino or Machiavelli did the same. Even putting aside the long history of the debate, Baron's scheme admits of as many exceptions as supporting examples. Porcari was part of Niccoli's and Bruni's circle (cf. L. Pastor, Storia dei Papi /Rome, 1958-64_7, vol. I, pp. 568-9) and Manetti was, according to Baron, one of the principal continuators of Civic Humanism after Bruni, but the one in 1427 and the other in 1453 defended the mercenary system; and Platina and Patrizi, who according to Baron were connected with Florence, attacked mercenaries as late as 1471 (Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 437-8).

1. VI, xxi.

2. Curtius, European Literature, p. 163.

3. Cf. Baron, Crisis, 1955 ed., vol. II, p. 540, note 38.

4. Cf. Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., p. 536, note 24; Manetti, Vita Dantis in Galletti, p. 78.

5. Ibid. p. 15.

than all ancient writers including Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero;¹ in Bruni's Dialogue *Salutati* said that Petrarch, Dante and Boccaccio equalled the ancients;² and Cino Rinuccini said that Petrarch combined the 'altezza di Vergilio colla dolcezza d'Ovidio'.³ It was a commonplace for Accolti to claim 'fuisse imprimis duos, Dantem, videlicet, et Franciscum Petrarcham, quorum neminem elegantia, suavitatem et sententiarum copia Virgilio aut Homero postponendum arbitrarer'.⁴

The panegyric style could sometimes be self-defeating. Its purpose was to convince the listener or reader of a subject's merits or failings, but if the claims made were so extreme as to be utterly absurd, they would never be accepted. The humanists were aware of this pitfall, and therefore sometimes qualified their panegyrics. *Salutati* conceded that Petrarch's Latin style ('*facultas dicendi*') was inferior to the ancients';⁵ Bruni admitted that Dante's Latin was poor,⁶ and that Petrarch's was not perfect;⁷ and Manetti said that their Latin was inferior not only to the ancients' but to many of his contemporaries'.⁸ Accolti too conceded that, although Dante's *Eclogues* and Petrarch's *Africa* were not entirely without merit, they were nevertheless not equal to many ancient works.⁹

Having made such reservations, the humanists still tried to compare Dante and Petrarch favourably with the ancients. Indeed, the history of the so-called 'Controversy over Dante and Petrarch' may be seen as a succession of various attempts to find a satisfactory panegyric

1. Baron, *Crisis*, 1966 ed., p. 258.

2. *Prosatori latini*, p. 68.

3. Baron, *Crisis*, 1955 ed., vol. II, p. 539.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 41v (Galletti, p. 122).

5. Baron, *Crisis*, 1966 ed., p. 258.

6. Bruni, *Vita di Dante* in *Schriften*, pp. 61-2.

7. Bruni, *Vita di Petrarca*, *ibid.* p. 65.

8. Manetti, *Vitae* in Galletti, p. 69.

9. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 42r (Galletti, p. 122).

formula.¹ One way was to place them in historical perspective, to say 'they did very well considering the age in which they lived' or 'it must be remembered that they were the very first to revive the study of letters.' This encomiastic theme was used by Filippo Villani, Boccaccio, Vergerio, Poggio, and especially by Bruni.² One could claim that they were more versatile than the ancients: thus Salutati, Bruni, Niccoli (in Bruni's Dialogue) and Manetti argued that Petrarch was greater than Cicero or Vergil because he excelled in composing both poetry and prose while they were proficient in only one genre or the other.³ Accolti himself used another version of the commonplace of versatility when he praised Petrarch and Dante for writing in both Latin and Italian.⁴

In addition to Petrarch and Dante, Accolti used the formula 'they equalled the ancients' to praise other modern men such as Francesco Sforza, Cosimo de' Medici, and Francesco Foscari,⁵ and besides this commonplace Accolti employed many other traditional techniques to praise his contemporaries. The three long accounts included in the Dialogue of Sforza, Cosimo and Foscari are short biographies written in chronological order, one of the methods of setting out a panegyric suggested in rhetorical textbooks.⁶ Many of the commonplaces that Accolti uses were from the textbooks too. The praise of an individual was usually based on

1. In attributing historical significance to the controversy over Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, Baron in Crisis, 1966 ed. pp. 254 seq., 286 seq., and 332 seq., has not taken into account that praise by means of comparison with the ancients was a rhetorical commonplace.

2. Ibid. pp. 260-8.

3. Ibid. p. 259; Bruni, Dialogus in Prosatori latini, pp. 92-4; id. Vita di Petrarca in Schriften, p. 67; Manetti, Vita Petrarcae, in Galletti, p. 84.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 41v-42r (Galletti, p. 122).

5. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 20v-23r, 32r-36r, 37r-37v (Galletti, pp. 113-4, 118-9, 120).

6. Rhetorica ad Herennium, III, 13; Cicero, De part. or. 75; Quintilian, III, vii, 15.

his character, his physical endowments, and external circumstances.¹ Regarding character, the individual's virtues were praised: prudence, justice, temperance and courage,² all of which, especially prudence, Accolti puts to frequent use.³ Other virtues, such as liberality, eloquence, magnanimity, and clemency were recommended⁴ and are used by Accolti.⁵ A special feature of a good character was thought to be a worthy education,⁶ an accomplishment for which Accolti praises Cosimo de' Medici.⁷ Another was to have merited the praise of one's fellows,⁸ such as when Accolti says that in their youth it was predicted that both Cosimo de' Medici and Francesco Sforza would do great things,⁹

1. Rhet. ad Her. III, 10; Cicero, De inv. II, 177; id. De part. or. 74; Quintilian, III, vii, 12.

2. Rhet. ad Her. III, 10-11; Cicero, De inv. II, 159; id. De part. or. 76-80; id. De oratore, II, 343-5.

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 19v-37v (Galletti, pp. 112-120):

Prudentia: Niccolò Acciaiuoli, Francesco Sforza, Donato Acciaiuoli, Rinaldo Gianfigliuzzi, Filippo Magalotti, Gino Capponi, Migliore Guadagni, Angelo Filippi, Giannozzo Fialippi, Cosimo de' Medici, Francesco Foscari

Iustitia: Francesco Carmignolo, Francesco Sforza

Fortitudo: Filippo Scolari, Braccio da Montagne, Francesco Sforza

Temperantia: Donato Acciaiuoli, Rinaldo Gianfigliuzzi, Filippo Magalotti, Bartolomeo Valori, Niccolò da Uzzano, Guido Tomasi, Cosimo de' Medici.

4. Cicero, De oratore, II, 343-5; id. De part. or. 376-80.

5. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 19v-37v (Galletti, pp. 112-20):

Liberalitas: Cosimo de' Medici

Eloquentia: Rinaldo Gianfigliuzzi, Filippo Magalotti, Cosimo de' Medici, Francesco Foscari

Magnitudo animi: Francesco Sforza

Clementia: Francesco Sforza, Cosimo de' Medici

6. Rhet. ad Her. III, 10, 13; Cicero, De part. or. 82; Quintilian, III, vii, 15.

7. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 32r (Galletti, p. 118).

8. Cicero, De oratore, II, 347.

9. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 8, fol. 21r, 32v (Galletti, pp. 113, 118); for one's success to be predicted was considered praiseworthy: Cicero De part. or. 73 and Quintilian, III, vii, 11.

or when he declares that not only Florence but all Tuscany sings Cosimo's praises.¹ Good qualities that were the sole possession of the individual were considered especially praiseworthy;² Accolti praises Francesco Sforza for his 'rara virtus'³ and Cosimo for having been alone in opposing the Venetian alliance in 1447 and supporting Francesco Sforza.⁴ A commonplace highly recommended was to say that the individual's virtue worked not to his own but to the common advantage;⁵ Accolti praises Cosimo, while in exile, for not ceasing to work for Florence's benefit⁶ and Francesco Foscari, although persecuted by enemies, for continuing to work in the public interest.⁷ Physical accomplishments and external circumstances were regarded as topoi of praise especially when they showed the individual exercising his virtue.⁸ Accolti praises Braccio and Francesco Sforza for the agility and quickness that made them good soldiers.⁹ High birth was considered praiseworthy if the subject lived up to his promise¹⁰ as did Cosimo de' Medici or Antonio, Niccolò and Benedetto Alberti;¹¹ low birth, on the other hand, could be turned into a topos of praise by pointing to the obstacles overcome by the individual's virtue,¹² as in the case of Francesco Carmagnola.¹³ Good

1. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 32r (Galletti, p.118).

2. Cicero, De oratore, II, 347-8; Quintilian, III,vii,16.

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 21v (Galletti, p. 113).

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 34v (Galletti, p. 119).

5. Cicero, De oratore, II, 343-4; 346; Quintilian, III, vii, 16.

6. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 33v (Galletti, p. 118).

7. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 37r-37v (Galletti, p. 120).

8. Quintilian, III,vii,13-14.

9. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 20v-21r (Galletti, p. 113). Cf. Rhet. ad Her. III,10;Cicero, De oratore, II, 342.

10. Rhet. ad Her. III, 13; Quintilian, III,vii, 10.

11. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 30v, 32r (Galletti, pp. 117,118).

12. Rhet. ad Her. III,13; Quintilian, III,vii,10.

13. Bibl. Laur. Codex 54,8, fol. 10v (Galletti, p. 112)

fortune might be praised for the use to which it was put,¹ as in the instance of Braccio and Carmagnola;² but to have borne adversity with nobility was especially laudable,³ such as Cosimo during his exile and Francesco Foscari after the disgrace of his son.⁴ Wealth and public honour were praiseworthy if put to good use and borne without ostentation or arrogance.⁵ Accolti says Bartolomeo Valori, Niccolò da Uzzano and Guido Tomasi had a reputation for integrity rather than riches;⁶ it is worth seeing, wrote Accolti, Cosimo de' Medici and his sons 'walk through the city, without pomp, without slaves, without ornate clothing: indeed, when visitors see them, they do not think' they are the famous Medici 'but just some ordinary men.'⁷

Part of the Dialogue was a list of famous Florentines of the past generation,⁸ most of whom had flourished between 1380 and 1420. That period was sometimes seen as a sort of Golden Age by the Florentines,⁹ and Accolti's list may show the influence of that belief. Some Florentines cited it as an age before the rise of the Medici in which the leading citizens of Florence shared power more equally;

1. Cicero, De oratore, II, 342; id. De part. or. 74.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 19v (Galletti, pp. 112-3).

3. Cicero, De oratore, II, 346.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 33v, 37v (Galletti, pp. 118, 120).

5. Rhet. ad Her. III, 10; Cicero, De oratore, II, 342.

6. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 30v (Galletti, p. 117).

7. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 35v (Galletti, p. 119). Accolti's encomium of Cosimo de' Medici is put into the context of similar portraits by A. M. Brown, 'The Humanist Portrait of Cosimo de' Medici, Pater Patriae,' Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXIV (1961), p. 194.

8. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 30r-31v (Galletti, pp. 117-8).

9. Cf. Rubinstein, The Government, p. 144; G. Rucellai, Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo Zibaldone: 'Il Zibaldone Quar-esimale', ed. A. Perosa (London, 1960), vol. I, p. 46.

but Accolti certainly was not of anti-Medicean persuasion, for at the end of the list he offered an extravagant encomium of Cosimo de' Medici. The reason for this lack of clear ideas about Florentine political life in the Dialogue lies in the nature of epideictic rhetoric. Accolti could only be interested in putting forth a political position in so far as it would be a form of panegyric. He might use the idea of the Golden Age to praise the men of his list, but he had to praise Cosimo de' Medici too. The nature of epideictic rhetoric hindered him from assuming a clear position on such matters. Every person mentioned in his list had to be praised and that obligation prevented him from offering any coherent form of political analysis.

Part of the Dialogue was concerned with praising contemporary cities, namely, Florence, Venice, Pisa, Genoa, Perugia, Arezzo and Siena. Panegyrics of cities had been an important part of epideictic literature since antiquity,¹ and all the qualities that Accolti singles out as laudable are commonplaces in this genre: beauty, good government, conquests, piety, letters, and civic virtue.² Accolti also praised Florence, Venice and Siena for having retained their liberty; that too was a commonplace of the genre: Aelius Aristides (A.D. 117 or 129-181 or later) praised Athens as the fountainhead of Greek liberty³ Bonevesino della Riva in his De magnalibus urbis Mediolani (1288) praised Milan's liberty.⁴ Much has been made of this commonplace,⁵ but it must be remembered that authors permitted themselves considerable license in the panegyric

1. Curtius, European Literature, p. 157; Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 191-211; Bonvicinus de Rippa, De magnalibus urbis Mediolani, ed. F. Novati, in Buletino dell'Istituto storico italiano, XX (1898), pp. 7-50.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 28v-38r (Galletti, pp. 116-20).

3. Cf. Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., p. 195.

4. Ed. Novati, ch. vii, pp. 155-6.

5. Cf. Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 191-211.

style.¹ For example, Aristeides pays great tribute to Athenian liberty in his Panathenaikos which has been seen as an important influence on Bruni and his ideas of liberty in the Laudatio Florentine urbis. Aristeides' work, like Bruni's, might itself be considered a document of Greek patriotism under Roman dominance. In fact, Aristeides wrote another panegyric, Eis Romen, in which he praised Rome and the glories of her empire. Another example are the writings of Salutati. As chancellor of Florence, when called upon to praise Florentine liberty, he condemned tyranny in the same breath. In the De tyranno, on the other hand, he discussed tyranny in a more moderate and rational way, distinguishing among its better and worse forms, not dismissing the entire phenomenon in one blast of censure as in his epideictic works.

Like much of epideictic literature, Accolti's Dialogue is banal. Composition, inventio, was based on searching out the appropriate loci communes; they were the 'argumentorum sedes' (Quintilian, V,x,20) and no credit was given for originality. Two parts of the Dialogue, however, demonstrate Accolti's interest in current controversies. One was his praise of contemporary lawyers, where he answered charges made by the humanists that 'they were so deeply engrossed in refuting their colleagues' opinions, that they seem to have lost all interest in truth.'² Accolti said that anyone who understood law would not doubt the learning of contemporary lawyers. The humanists, puffed up with their knowledge of rhetoric and literature, would be better advised to take heed of the opinion of those who understood law; the lawyers' bad style did not mean that they failed to understand their subject.³ The current dispute between philosophers and rhetoricians was reflected in the Dialogue too. Accolti points out that philosophia means sapientie studium, and requires sound arguments, not ornate language. He praises modern philosophers, the scho-

1. Cf. Curtius, European Literature, p. 164.

2. Poggio, letter to Accolti, cited above p. 56; for more examples of humanist criticism of lawyers, cf. ibid. pp. 56-7.

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 45r (Galletti, p. 123).

lastics and the Arabs, but says that in ancient Rome philosophers were for a long time unheard of and were eventually received only with hostility.¹ Significantly, Accolti fails to mention Cicero among the few Roman philosophers, apparently in disagreement with other humanists such as Bruni who assigned him the highest rank among philosophers.² Bruni and other humanists also condemned the scholastics for their bad style and maintained that philosophy was inseparable from eloquence.³ Accolti may in part owe his opinion to two of his authorities: St Augustine, who had cited Varro as an example of a philosopher lacking in eloquence, and to Lactantius, who had said that the Church Fathers, although learned, were not polished writers. In Florence too during the 1450's such ideas about philosophy were beginning to be put forward in humanist circles. In February 1457 Johannes Argyropulos began lecturing there and from the start he seems to have been critical of humanists such as Bruni for their ignorance of philosophy, for their opinion that philosophy and eloquence were intimately linked, and for their disdain for speculative philosophy. Some of Argyropulos' pupils, such as Alamanno Rinuccini, apparently learned from him a respect for the scholastics,⁴ similar to Accolti's, and Accolti's own ideas about philosophy may reflect Argyropulos' influence. Since the Dialogue was written between 1461 and 1463, the passage on philosophy may reflect the interest aroused in Accolti by Argyropulos' early lectures. Moreover, evidence has already been brought forward to suggest that Accolti, together with Piero de' Pazzi and Otto Niccolini, was part of Argyropulos' circle in Florence.⁵ Another influence may

1. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,8, fol. 42r-44v (Galletti, p. 123).

2. Prosatori latini, p. 54.

3. Cf. J. E. Seigel, 'The Teaching of Argyropulos and the Rhetoric of the First Humanists,' in Action and Conviction, pp. 238-40.

4. Ibid. pp. 240-56, passim.

5. Cf. above p. 68. Seigel, in Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism. The union of eloquence and wisdom, Petrarch to Valla (Princeton, 1969), pp. 233-6, regards Accolti's praise of philosophy as part of a long

have been Marsilio Ficino and his friends; for he was expressing ideas similar to Argyropulos' as early as 1454¹ and is known to have been befriended by Accolti and his circle.²

tradition of respect for scholasticism in Florence. But I cannot agree that Accolti's opinions 'may have something to do with his distinguished family background, and with his interest in the history of the Middle Ages. Like Bruni, Accolti was born in Arezzo, but of a much more prominent family; his father was a doctor of law (Bruni's was a dealer in grain). Before becoming chancellor of Florence, Accolti had a successful career as a lawyer -- whereas most of the humanists were notaries. Even after he became chancellor he continued to practice law, and for a time his income from his legal practice exceeded his salary as chancellor.' (p. 233) 'The most prominent humanists of the Quattrocento did not come from patrician families like the Manetti of Florence. . . . The great humanist chancellors of Florence -- Salutati, Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini, Carlo Marsuppini -- were not even native Florentines. . . . Men like Cino Rinuccini and Giannozzo Manetti in Florence. . . all belonged to a different social group, and therefore had a different perspective. The same may be said of Benedetto Accolti, despite his having served for a time as chancellor of Florence.' (pp. 240-1) But Accolti's position in Florence was far less secure than Bruni's. His family was respectable, but hardly distinguished; whatever prominence they enjoyed was in Arezzo, not Florence. He was never very well off financially, but Bruni, Poggio, and Marsuppini were rich men. Marsuppini's family certainly enjoyed a social position as high or higher in Florence and Arezzo than Accolti's; his father was a lawyer, diplomat, 'the richest man in Arezzo, and a business associate of Cosimo de' Medici's. It is hard to believe that humanists such as Bruni or Poggio would have been so unsure of their positions as to find it necessary to attack scholastic philosophy. By that argument, Accolti might be expected to have been an antagonist of the scholastics; for when he wrote the Dialogue, he himself admitted that he had little experience as a humanist. Nor did 'Accolti. . . have a higher opinion of medieval achievements in all realms than men like Salutati and Bruni did.' (p. 234) Bruni's History of Florence and Accolti's History of the First Crusade had precisely the same purpose: to celebrate the deeds of men in the middle ages, about whom no elegant work was available. Salutati was not as interested in medieval history as Accolti and Bruni, but like Accolti he was a defender of moderns such as Petrarch.

1. P. O. Kristeller, Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters (Rome, 1956), p. 146.

2. Cf. above p. 67.

Accolti's discussion of philosophy and law in the Dialogue are of some interest for history of fifteenth century thought; his discussion of Christian history very nearly reaches the limits of the analytic powers of epideictic rhetoric. By means of the concept of a fixed antiquity, he had been able to discuss the history of the church in what today would be called historical perspective. But for him and other humanists it was only one more way of praising or blaming. The rest of the Dialogue failed to attain such intellectual heights and is more typical of epideictic rhetoric, which tends to reduce human experience to black and white categories.

CHAPTER V: ACCOLTI'S HISTORY OF THE FIRST CRUSADE AND FLORENTINE DIPLOMACY IN THE EAST

Accolti's major work was the De bello a christianis contra barbaros gesto, a history of the First Crusade, which he dedicated to Piero di Cosimo de' Medici.¹ It has been stated that Accolti's history 'è l'unico scritto /sc. storico_7 del xv secolo nel quale una materia storica è trattata da un umanista solo per amor di essa. (Che il pericolo turco desse all'oggetto una certa attualità, è cosa che può appena esser presa in considerazione).'²

The purpose of this chapter will be to assess the truth of this assertion; an attempt will be made to clarify the background of Accolti's history and in particular to consider its relation to Florentine diplomacy in the East after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

There is no external evidence of when the history was presented to Piero di Cosimo. It was probably not before November 1463, when Giovanni, Cosimo's elder son, died; for in the Preface Cosimo and Piero are referred to as the luminaries of their age, while Giovanni is not mentioned.

1. The presentation copy is codex 54, 6 of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence (cf. fol. 111v: 'LIBER PETRI DE MEDICIS COS. F.') Other manuscripts are:

- (a) Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 670 (formerly 104 H.L.), fifteenth-century, vellum, illuminated initials and title pages, 108 fols, Italian hand.
- (b) Berne, Stadtbibliothek. Variants indicated by Bongars in the margins of the Basle 1544 edition of De bello, according to a lost manuscript belonging to the English ambassador in Venice in the early seventeenth century. Shelf-mark X.240. (Cf. Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux, vol. V, p. cxxxvii; H. Hagen, 'Eine neue Handschrift von Benedetto Accoltis Geschichte des Kreuzzuges,' Vierteljahrsschrift für Kultur und Litteratur der Renaissance, I (1885), pp. 134-6.

(c) Archivio Storico Comunale, Genova, Codex 172. Accolti's history has most recently been published in Recueil, vol. V, pp. 529-620; the text, however, was prepared without knowledge of the Laurentian codex.

2. E. Fueter, Storia della storiografia moderna, tr. A. Spinelli (Naples, 1944), vol. I, p. 28.

If Giovanni had still been alive, it would be odd for Piero and Cosimo to have been singled out. On the other hand, if the Preface had been written after Cosimo died on 1 August 1464, one would expect to find some reference to his death; for the memory of it would still have been very much alive to Accolti, who died only seven weeks later.¹ It seems likely, therefore, that the history was finished sometime between November, 1463, when Giovanni died, and 1 August 1464, the date of Cosimo's death.

There may be clues to a more precise dating in the Preface. Addressing Piero, Accolti says, 'Nam ad quem alium quam ad te aut patrem tuum meos labores rectius destinarem, quos patrie decus, maxima lumina nostre etatis, unicum pene doctis presidium omnes esse confitentur?' One would at first sight suppose that while Accolti was writing both Cosimo and Piero were alive. In the next sentence, however, in referring to Cosimo, Accolti uses the past tense: 'nil ei defuit unquam quod in summo protinus viro sapiens quisque desideraret,' giving the impression that Cosimo was dead. In the following sentence Accolti once more uses the present: 'viget in eo ingens memoria, divinum ingenium atque ita versatile, ut ad omnia natus videatur.' Accolti then goes on to say, however, that Cosimo 'eloquentiam sapientie ac doctrinam addidit litterarum', and in speaking of his other qualities and accomplishments continues to use the past. But at the end of the Preface Accolti again implies that Cosimo is alive: 'boni omnes esse desiderant, ut postquam Cosma quod nature debet exsolverit, tu patriam, amicos et omnem etruriam tuearis.'²

These changes of tense seem to indicate that at the time Accolti was writing his Preface, Cosimo's death was imminently expected. Accolti's mention of Cosimo's excellent memory and keen intellect sounds as though it might be a comment made about someone on his deathbed, as though Accolti were exclaiming how remarkable it was that Cosimo still had full command of his mental faculties. Especially suggestive

1. Cf. p. 119 above.

2. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54, 6, fol. 2r-2v; Recueil, vol. V, pp. 530-1.

is Accolti's mention of Piero's succession after Cosimo's death. Cosimo in fact underwent a long illness before his death. In May 1464 he began to suffer from a urinary complaint, a severe rash and a fever; by the middle of July it had become clear he was fading away.¹ This evidence suggests that Accolti wrote the Preface and presented his history to Piero between May and 1 August 1464, the date of Cosimo's death. According to Vespasiano da Bisticci, Accolti began work on the History after he became chancellor in 1458,² and in the Preface Accolti said he had recently (nuper) had the idea of writing a historical work on the crusades.³

The reason he wrote the history, Accolti says, was that the crusades had been neglected by previous historians; as a result, the early crusaders had been almost forgotten by his day. If their memory were revived, he believed, people might be moved to follow the example of their courage and 'delerent . . . communem labem nostra etate maxime auctam, quod, scilicet, hostes christi religionis non modo sepulchrum eius tenent, sed longe ac late suum imperium extenderunt.'⁴ Accolti intended to offer the deeds of the early crusaders as examples to his contemporaries to join in a crusade against the Turks.

It may seem strange that the Florentine chancellor wrote in support of a crusade, since it has generally been believed that their growing commercial interests in the East prejudiced the Florentines against a war with the Turks after the fall of Constantinople.⁵ As first chancellor Accolti

1. G. Pieraccini, La stirpe de' Medici di Cafaggiolo (Florence, 1947), vol. I, pp. 31-3.

2. Vite, p. 597.

3. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,6, fol. 1v; Recueil, vol. V, p. 530.

4. Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,6, fol. 2r; Recueil, vol. V, p. 530.

5. This has been argued in the two works which treat in most detail of Florentine Eastern diplomacy: L. Pastor, Storia dei papi, vol. I, pp. 622-3, 702, 715; ibid. vol. II, pp. 17-8, 53, 56-7, 210-11, 237-9, 242, 253, 265-6 and G.B. Picotti, La dieta di Mantova e la politica de' Veneziani, in Miscellanea di storia della R. Deputazione di storia, ser. IIIa, vol. IV (Venice, 1912), pp. 74-5, 79-81, 369-372. The biographies of Pius II by Voigt, Ady and Mitchell

was Florence's official apologist, so that he would be expected to write in favour of Florentine policy. The history may have been the product of his personal support of a crusade. Alternatively, Florence might not have been so much opposed to a war against the Turks as has been hitherto assumed. In endeavouring to understand Accolti's motives, Florence's policy in the East up to 1464 must be considered in greater detail than has yet been attempted.

* * *

When in early July 1453 the Florentines first learned that Constantinople had fallen to the Turks,¹ they were at war with Venice, so that some of them were reported to have been glad about the losses incurred by the Venetians in Constantinople.² But the Florentines themselves had suffered considerably there, and their allies the Genoese had probably lost even more than the Venetians.³ The Florentine Signoria wrote to their ambassador in Genoa, 'non si potrebbe significarti quanta tristitia abbiamo preso di questa dolorosa nuova della perdita di Costantinopoli. . . tutti e principi de cristiani. . . doverebbonsi pacificarsi insieme, et tutto il resto degli altri christiani si doverebono vestire a bruno, per dimostrare universale cordoglio et prenderne sì general et sì fiero sdegno che tutti si missino alla recuperatione

and the studies of F. Babinger in Archivio storico italiano, CXXI (1963), pp. 307 seq. and in Rivista storica italiana, LXIII (1951), p. 494 repeat this view. Only M. Mallett, The Florentine Galleys in the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1967), p. 35, has presented evidence to the contrary.

1. Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 622-3; cf. R. Schwoebel, The Shadow of the Crescent. The Renaissance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517 (Nieuwkoop, 1967), p. 3.

2. Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 622-3. Cf. Benedetto Dei's claim that the Venetians were responsible for the fall of Constantinople, in the passages from his Cronica edited by G. F. Pagnini, Della decima e di varie altre gravèzze imposte dal comune di Firenze (Lisbon and Lucca, 1765-66), vol. II, pp. 246-7.

3. Jacopo Tedaldi, a Florentine merchant present at the siege of Constantinople, said the Florentines lost 20,000 ducats, the Venetians 200,000 ducats, and that the Genoese losses were immeasurable. Cf. Jacopo Tedaldi, 'Informations . . . de la prinse de Constantinople par l'empereur Tur . . . ' in E. Martène and U. Durand, Thesaurus novus anecdotorum (Paris, 171), vol. 1, col. 1823.

di detti luoghi.¹

Pope Nicholas V felt it was up to him to arrange peace in Italy in order to meet the Turkish threat and summoned a congress in Rome at the beginning of October, 1453.² At the congress the Florentines supported the pope's peace plans and the Signoria went so far as to complain that his policy was not adequate to cure the disease affecting Italy,³ and their ambassadors wrote that he was becoming cool about the crusade.⁴ In the end the peace talks collapsed and it was only as a result of secret negotiations between Venice and Milan that peace was concluded in April, 1454, and a defensive league formed.⁵ After the Peace of Lodi the Florentines continued to be eager for a war against the Turks; they wrote to the Emperor congratulating him for having called a diet to organize the crusade, promising to send ambassadors to it.⁶ Writing to the pope to recommend two Florentine knights hospitaller who wanted to join the crusade, they said that the pope's assistance would allow the Floren-

1. N. Iorga, Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire de la croisade au xvme siècle, 2^e ser. (Paris, 1899), p. 499. Cf. ibid. pp. 489-493; D. Buoninsegni, Istorie della città di Firenze (Florence, 1637), p. 103; G. Cambi, Istorie, ed. Fr. Ildefonso di San Luigi in Delizie, vol. XX, p. 311. Recommending an ambassador of the King of Cyprus to the pope in September 1453, the Florentine Signoria wrote that, if peace were established in Italy, the Florentines would be prepared to join a crusade against the Turks (G. Müller, Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'oriente cristiano e coi Turchi (Florence, 1879), pp. 178-9).

2. Storia di Milano (Milan, 1953-66), vol. VII, p. 55.

3. ASF, Miss., 39, fol. 208r-208v.

4. Iorga, Notes, p. 502. Cf. the Florentine reaction to a rumour that the King of Aragon had died, ASF, Miss. 39, fol. 206r and the reception accorded to Cardinal Isidore of Russia in Florence in January, 1454 (Pastor, Storia, vol. I, p. 626; Cambi, Istorie, p. 322; Buoninsegni, Istorie, pp. 108-9). Florentine interests in Italy required peace: cf. Storia di Milano, vol. VII, p. 55. The Florentines were putting pressure on the Genoese to make peace with the King of Aragon (Iorga, Notes, p. 493).

5. Storia di Milano, vol. VII, pp. 56-64; Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 628-34.

6. Müller, Documenti, p. 180.

tine people, in the person of these two knights, to contribute to the defence of the faith.¹

Although the first wave of excitement had passed, the Florentines were still willing to support the crusade at the beginning of the pontificate of Nicholas V's successor, Calixtus III.² The ambassadors who were sent to swear obedience to the new pope had instructions to mention the crusade,³ and one of them, Sant'Antonino, the Archbishop of Florence, delivered a stirring oration to encourage the pope to crush the Turks.⁴ When, a few weeks later, an ambassador from Thomas Paleologus, Despot of the Morea, came to Florence, he was told that the Florentines were willing at any time to take part in a joint crusade,⁵ and later that summer, at the request of the King of Naples, the Florentines instructed their ambassador in Rome to entreat the pope to give top priority to a war against the Turks.⁶ In 1456 the King of Portugal requested safe-conduct through Florentine territory for the forces he was going to send to the crusade, and the Florentine government answered that they would lend him every possible assistance and would treat his subjects like their own.⁷ When the pope protested that Florentine officials in Pisa had subjected some goods intended for the crusade to the gabella, the Signoria wrote back that as soon as they had learned of it, and even before they had received his letter, they had allowed the goods to pass

1. Ibid. pp. 180-1.

2. Cf. ASF, Missive, 40, fol. 119v, 125v, for two letters to Calixtus III in which the Florentines urged him to fight the Turks.

3. ASF, El. ed Istruz., 13, fol. 136v-137r; cf. Due legazioni al sommo pontifice per il comune di Firenze presedute da Sant'Antonino Arcivescovo, ed. C. Guasti (Florence, 1857), p. 4.

4. Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 667-8; Sant'Antonino, Chronica, III, xxii, cap. xvi; Due legazioni, pp. 17-8.

5. Müller, Documenti, pp. 181-2.

6. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 13, fol. 153r-153v, 154v.

7. ASF, CP, 54, fol. 39v, 41r-41v; ASF, Responsive, 1, fol. 41r-41v; Müller, Documenti, pp. 183-5.

free of charge.¹

Moreover, the Florentines helped to raise money for the crusade. In May 1455 they told the pope that they were and always would be prepared to assist in collecting a crusading tenth in their territories,² and at the end of that year the pope ordered that the taxes which had been collected in this way should be used to equip four galleys and a ship at Porto Pisano destined to defend the Aegean Islands the following summer.³ The Florentines were not so enthusiastic about the next tenth which was levied in the summer of 1456; they wrote to the pope that their clergy was already suffering under a burden of 40,000 florins from the last one.⁴ But in the end they gave in, and when asked whether they would contribute galleys or men to the crusade, they replied that they would equip as many galleys as the pope saw fit.⁵

Nevertheless, the Florentines were now concerned for their trade in the East. The Eastern Mediterranean provided one of the largest markets for Florentine wool and silk, and goods in heavy demand in Europe, such as Turkish cotton, carpets, hides, and slaves, were brought back.⁶ Even before the fall of Constantinople, Florentine trade in the East had been seriously hampered as a result of their war against Naples and Venice; in order to revive it, the Florentines would have to maintain friendly relations with the Sultan. Although after the fall of Constantinople the Florentines showed themselves willing to cooperate in the crusade, they requested at the same time a safe-conduct from Mehmed II for their merchants,⁷ and after it had been granted, they

1. ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 42r; ASF, Miss. 41, fol. 6v-7r.

2. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 13, fol. 137v-138r.

3. ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 25r; Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 686-7; cf. Due legazioni, p. 20.

4. ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 22v, 23r-24v; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 13, fol. 155v, 158r-159v; ASF, Miss. 40, fol. 149v-150r.

5. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 13, fol. 161r. The pope was evidently satisfied with this reply: cf. Miss. 40, fol. 174r.

6. Mallett, Florentine Galleys, pp. 114, 122.

7. Müller, Documenti, p. 182.

again began to trade more actively in the East. Communal galley voyages were resumed in 1456 when a galley was commissioned by the Arte della Lana to carry cloth to the East.¹ In order to protect their galleys from ardent supporters of the crusade as well, it was decided, when two Eastern galleys were being prepared the next year, to ask for safe-conducts from the pope and the King of Naples.²

Thus until the beginning of 1457 the Florentines' Eastern policy was two-faced: they cooperated with the effort to launch a crusade, while expanding their oriental trade. But after 1457 they were less willing to support a war against the Turks. One reason for their change of heart may have been the success of their Eastern trade, which was expanding after 1456.³ Another was certainly the lack of interest other Christian states were showing in the crusade. For two years neither the King of France nor the Duke of Urbino had allowed the tenth to be collected. The King of Portugal, who had been allowed to keep the tenths from his clergy, had never appeared with the fleet he had promised; and the Ragusans, to whom the Dalmatian tenths had been entrusted, refused to consign them.⁴ At the beginning of 1457 the pope ordered another tenth to be levied from the Florentine clergy, but this time the Florentines protested vehemently. Their ambassador in Rome was instructed to inform the pope that nobody but the Florentines had been subjected to two tenths in one year, and that more money had been taken from Florence in the name of the crusade than from the rest of Italy put together.⁵ The Florentines

1. Mallett, Florentine Galleys, pp. 67-8.

2. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 14, fol. 45r-45v. It was granted by the pope but not by the king, and in the end it was decided to allow the galleys to sail without the king's safe-conduct: cf. ASF, Miss. 41, fol. 56r-56v; Mallett, Florentine Galleys, p. 68, is in error when he says that these galleys did not sail.

3. Ibid. pp. 67 seq.

4. Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 696-9, 700, 702, 739.

5. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 14, fol. 36r, 37v, 45v.

were bitter because they believed other states had not given as much support to the crusade as they themselves. Their ambassador was instructed to tell the pope that the Florentine clergy was as poor as any in Italy, and would be utterly ruined by the proposed tenth. If the pope persisted in his intentions, he was to be told that the tenth would be impossible to collect; not only the Florentine clergy but the laity too, they were to say, were impoverished, as preachers of the crusade had extracted a fortune with the help of loose women and thugs.¹

The Florentines remained reluctant to commit themselves to a crusade for the rest of Calixtus's pontificate,² and for the first few years of that of his successor, Pius II. Pius was especially keen on the crusade, and the very day he was elected he declared that he intended to liberate Christendom from the infidel.³ The Florentine ambassadors who were sent to swear obedience to the new pope were allowed to discuss the crusade, but not to commit the Signoria in any way.⁴ Sant'Antonino again delivered an oration on this occasion, but he was now noticeably cooler on the subject of the crusade than he had been in his oration to Calixtus.⁵ When Pius soon afterwards called a congress to discuss subsidies for the war, the Florentines sent ambassadors who wrote back that Pius was not satisfied with general promises, and was counting on Florentine aid the following summer; thereupon, the Signoria ordered the ambassadors to hedge until other states committed themselves.⁶ When in December

1. Ibid. fol. 36r, 37v, 38r, 45v-46r.

2. Cf. the Florentine attitude to the papal congress on the crusade in the spring of 1458: ASF, CP, 54, fol. 165r-165v, 180r-180v. There is no record that the Florentines ever sent ambassadors to the congress.

3. Pastor, Storia, vol. II, p. 15; Pius II wrote to the Florentines on 8 September 1458 that he expected them to take part in his expedition against the Turks (ASF, Resp. I, fol. 64v).

4. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 5v; cf. Due legazioni, pp. 49-50.

5. Sant'Antonino, Chronica, III, xxii, cap. xvii, par. i.

6. L. Crivelli, De expeditione Pii Papae II adversus Turcos,

1458 the pope once again asked the Florentines what they would contribute, their reply was discussed in the Pratica. Almost all the speakers in it were opposed to the pope's plan; it was argued that the Florentines were impoverished, that the crusade was more the affair of the Hungarians and Germans than theirs; that Florentine trade would suffer, and that since the pope alone wanted a crusade, his own support would have to suffice. It was finally agreed that the Signoria should answer in general terms and wait and see what others did.¹ The Signoria accepted the advice of the Pratica and told their ambassadors to use 'buone parole' with the pope, but to insist that the Florentines could do no more than other Christians and that nothing could be promised at present.²

At the beginning of his pontificate Pius II had announced that he would convoke a congress to plan the crusade;³ Florentine diplomacy regarding the Congress of Mantua reflected their changed attitude to the crusade. They were reluctant to send their ambassadors to Mantua, especially since few other ambassadors had appeared and it was only after many others had arrived and the pope had written them four letters, in the last of which he threatened to denounce them in public, that they finally sent their ambassadors.⁴

ed. G. C. Zimolo in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, XXIII, fasc. v (Bologna, n.d.), pp. 96-8; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 13r-14r; Picotti, La dieta, p. 81; Due legazioni, pp. 59-60.

1. ASF, CP, 55, fol. 90r-91v. Giannozzo Pitti (fol. 90v) was the only speaker who showed sympathy with the pope's plans.

2. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 16r-17v.

3. Pastor, Storia, vol. II, p. 17.

4. The pope first wrote to the Florentines from Bologna on 14 March (ASF, Resp. I, fol. 75v). On 23 May the Florentine ambassadors were elected and told to leave by 23 June (Picotti, La dieta, p. 158). On 1 June, although no ambassadors from important states had yet arrived in Mantua, Pius II opened the congress and again wrote to the Florentines (ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 75v-76r). But on 14 June the Florentines, not wanting their ambassadors to be the first to arrive, instructed them not to leave until 8 July (Picotti,

The secret instructions which they were given reveal Florence's attitude: despite Pius's having insisted that they be provided with full powers, the ambassadors were ordered to promise nothing without the Signoria's explicit approval.¹

Nevertheless, the Florentines were unwilling to go too far in opposing the pope. The ambassadors to the congress carried a set of public instructions to be read out in concistory which ostensibly gave them the full powers required by the pope.² They were to say that although the Signoria was concerned for the safety of the Florentine galleys then at Constantinople, they did want to support

La dieta, p. 158). On 12 June the pope again wrote to them (ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 77r-77v). On 3 July the question was discussed in the Pratica and everyone but Guglielmo Tanagli agreed that the ambassadors should not yet be sent (ASF, CP, 55, fol. 131r-134v); the Signoria therefore instructed the ambassadors not to leave until 8 August (Picotti, La dieta, p. 158). Ambassadors were prohibited from holding other communal offices, but ordinarily in such cases of delay this restriction would have been lifted. In this instance, however, it was feared that the pope would be angered if he learned the restrictions had been lifted, so that the ambassadors at first remained ineligible for other offices (ASF, CP, 55, fol. 133v); at the end of July, however, the restrictions were lifted (ASF, Provv., 150, fol. 75r-75v). At the end of July other ambassadors had begun to arrive in Mantua and the pope again wrote to the Signoria (ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 79r-79v). At the same time Filippo de' Medici, the Bishop of Arezzo, and Lionardo Vernacci wrote to Giovanni di Cosimo de' Medici asking him to help in having the ambassadors sent. On 8 August the Florentines elected new ambassadors to Mantua, but their instructions were not ratified, so that the previous ambassadors were reelected and told to leave by 25 August (Picotti, La dieta, p. 158). On 14 August the pope wrote to the Archbishop of Florence requiring him to use his influence to have the ambassadors sent (L. Pastor, Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste, vol. I /Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1904/, p. 111) and on 16 August he wrote to Florence for the last time (ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 79v-80v). Owing to last-minute delays, the ambassadors were not able to leave on 25 August, but rather on 31 August (Picotti, La dieta, p. 159; del Piazzo, Il protocollo, pp. 43-4).

1. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 26v-28r.

2. Ibid. fol. 29v-30v.

the crusade; they asked the pope to guarantee himself that their subsidy would be paid, so that they could avoid putting a promise in writing which would antagonize the Sultan. In this way, they agreed to a tenth on clerical incomes for the next three years, a twentieth on the incomes of Jews, and a thirtieth on those of the laity.¹ Even before the congress the Florentines had tried to keep up appearances. On his way to Mantua, Pius, accompanied by Galeazzo Maria Sforza, had stayed in Florence as the guest of the commune; 13,500 florins had been spent on entertaining them, and three Catasti had had to be levied to meet the cost, the last two of which had been strongly opposed in the councils.² Their correspondence with the pope before the congress had always been carefully worded: they had repeatedly professed their obedience and their willingness to take part in a crusade.³ It was only when it came to paying for it that they became evasive.

When in January 1460 the pope came to Florence on his way back from Mantua, he was again the guest of the commune.⁴ During his stay he pressed the Florentines to say how they were intending to carry out the promises they had made at Mantua.⁵ They answered that they hoped the pope would post-

1. Ibid. fol. 32v-33v; Pius II, Commentaries, tr. F. A. Gragg in Smith College Studies in History, XXII n. 1-2 (1936-7), XXV n. 1-4 (1939-40), XXX (1947), XXXV (1951), XLIII (1957), p. 257; Pastor, Storia, vol. II, p. 64.

2. ASF, Provv. 150, fol. 8r, 43v-45r, 186v; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 16r; ASF, CP, 55, fol. 103v-104v, 105v-106v, 112v-117r; ASF, Libri fabarum, 66, fol. 4r-5r, 12r-18r; ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 72v-73r; ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 32v-33r; ASF, Miss. 42, fol. 103r-103v; Pastor, Storia, vol. II, pp. 45-6; Pius II, Commentaries, p. 166. The pope, commenting on how little of the money was spent on him (ibid.), was not fair in judging the Florentines's respect for him (cf. ASF, CP, 55, fol. 103v-104v).

3. Cf. for example, Crivelli, De expeditione, p. 89; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 17r; Pastor, Ungedr. Akten, p. 112.

4. He arrived on 27 January and stayed in Florence all the following day (Picotti, La dieta, p. 370). The Florentines were again careful to show respect for him, and 1500 florins were set aside for entertaining him (cf. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 26r-26v, 28v-29v).

5. Pius II, Commentaries, p. 301; ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 56v. The pope also asked for an orator to be sent

pone collecting the taxes to which they had consented. He agreed in the belief that they had meant only the taxes on the laity, since he considered the clergy to have nothing to do with the commune. The Florentines, on the other hand, thought that all the taxes were to be deferred; for they considered the clergy a part of the commune and any clerical tax to require the consent of the Signoria.¹ Therefore, the arrival of papal tax collectors in Florence at the be-

to him in Siena to discuss the subsidies further (ASF, CP, fol. 42r). The Pratica was called on 28 January to discuss these requests. First Manno Temperani asked what the orators at Mantua had actually promised, and Antonio Ridolfi, one of them, said that they had acted only in accordance with their instructions. Bernardo Giugni, Carlo Pandolfini and Giannozzo Pitti suggested that Cosimo de' Medici be consulted but Giovanni di Cosimo said that his father did not want to be brought into the matter, for he did not want to take the blame from the pope; anyway, he, Giovanni, knew what Cosimo thought: namely, that without the assent of the councils no reply could be given, but that at the appropriate time the Florentines would carry out their promises. The rest of the speakers agreed with him and also said that orators should not be sent to the pope in Siena (ibid. fol. 39v-42r).

1. Four citizens were chosen to meet the pope (ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 56v; ASF, CP, 56, fol. 49v, 51v). They told him that the taxes could not be granted without the approval of the councils (Pius II, Commentaries, p. 301); and that the twentieth and thirtieth would be more difficult than the tenth to collect (Picotti, La dieta, p. 370; cf. ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 56v and Pius II, Commentaries, p. 301). There was some confusion about what taxes the Florentines had asked to be deferred. Clearly, Pius II believed that the Florentines had only asked for the twentieth and thirtieth to be put off: according to what his ambassador later said in Florence (ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 56v) the four Florentines asked for only the twentieth and the thirtieth to be deferred and according to what Pius himself told the Milanese ambassador (Picotti, La dieta, p. 370) they had consented to allow the tenth to be collected immediately; he may have received this impression because according to the Papal Legate (ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 56v) 'quidam. . . gravissimi et sapientissimi viri' told the pope that the Florentines believed ecclesiastical benefices were subject completely to the papacy. The Florentines, however, certainly believed that Pius II had deferred the tenth too (cf. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 49r, 49v, 51v, 55v, 58v); it was frequently said in the Pratica that the clergy were subject to the commune (ibid. 52r, 54v, 56v).

ginning of March¹ caused a great sensation. The Pratica was immediately summoned, and morning and afternoon there were heated discussions. At first everyone was agreed that the pope must be made to desist: it was argued that the clergy were the subjects of the commune, that the pope was aiming to make himself ruler of Florence, that Florentine liberty was being grossly infringed, and the Florentines were being forced to be the first to contribute to the crusade.² But when it became clear that the pope was determined to collect the tenth,³ people began to concede that more harm than good might come from opposing him.⁴ The result of this was that while some speakers in the Pratica continued to oppose the pope's plan,⁵ many of the former champions of liberty now said that since the Florentines were no longer agreed amongst themselves, it was useless to con-

1. Meanwhile, on 20 February a papal legate had come to Florence again asking for an ambassador to be sent to Siena to discuss the tenth with the pope (ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 44v) but apparently no ambassador was sent. Ignatius, Abbot of the Badia in Florence, came to Florence at the beginning of March (ASF, CP 56, fol. 47v) with a papal brief designating him collector of the tenth dated 17 January 1459 (ab inc.) (ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 69v-70r).

2. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 47v-57v, 76r-77r.

3. On 13 March the pope told the Milanese ambassador that he was contemplating grave censures against the Florentines (Picotti, La dieta, p. 371). On March 17 the papal legate, Niccolò Palmieri, the bishop of Orte, addressed the Signoria, recalling their promises at Mantua and to the pope when he had been in Florence; if the Florentines persisted in their obstinacy, he said 'pontificem in animo habere quod ea decernat que sibi in rem fore videbantur.' (ASF, Risposte d'oratori, 1, fol. 55v-47r). The Milanese ambassador attributed the Florentine unwillingness to cooperate with the pope to Cosimo de' Medici, who supposedly was angry with the pope that Filippo de' Medici, Bishop of Arezzo, had not been made a cardinal (cf. Pastor, Ungedruckte Akten, p. 120; Picotti, La dieta, p. 371).

4. In the Pratica of 18 March 1459 (ab inc.) Carlo Pandolfi, Giannozzo Pitti, Martino Scarfa, Bernardo de' Medici, Ugolino Martelli, Dietisalvi Neroni and especially Otto Niccolini were in favour of yielding to the pope (ASF, CP, 56, fol. 59r-62v).

5. In the Pratica of 18 March, Matteo Palmieri, Mariotto Benvenuti, Bartolomeo Lenzi and Antonio Ridolfi were against yielding to the pope (ibid. fol. 60r-63r).

tinue their resistance.¹ In the end, everyone conceded that the pope should be allowed to collect the tenth; for, as it was put by Dietisalvi Neroni, who can but agree that the pope is the lord of the clergy.² These discussions in the Pratica mark another turning point in Florentine policy toward the East; for after 1460 the commune was once again willing to support a crusade as it had been before 1457.³ Alternatively, if the Florentines were not especially eager for the crusade in itself, they were at least unwilling to act against the wishes of the pope. The much discussed tenth was collected in Florence in 1460, and the Florentines consigned the proceeds to the pope.⁴

Nevertheless, throughout Pius II's pontificate the Florentines continued trading with the Turks. In 1458 they sent two galleys to the East with a letter to the Sultan requesting a safe-conduct for their merchants.⁵ They had also asked for a safe-conduct from the pope which he had granted on condition that the Florentines did not carry arms or other prohibited goods to the Turks.⁶ Their concern for their galleys in Constantinople had necessitated the elaborate precautions taken by the Florentines at the Congress of Mantua to avoid giving the impression to the Sultan that they supported the crusade.⁷ The pope, in his turn, had created difficulties for the Florentine galleys during the congress; for at one point, when it was rumoured that the Florentines were selling arms to the Sultan, he had come close to forbidding all commerce with the Turks.⁸

1. Ibid. fol. 63v-65v.

2. Ibid. fol. 64r.

3. The Duke of Milan and Cosimo de' Medici may have influenced the Florentines to give in to the pope. Cf. Picotti, La dieta, p. 372 and ASF, CP, 56, fol. 63v-64r.

4. Ibid. fol. 100v, 140v-141v, 160r-160v.

5. Picotti, La dieta, pp. 74-5; Mallett, Florentine Galleys, p. 68.

6. Picotti, La dieta, p. 75; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 7r; Due legazioni, pp. 52, 56.

7. Cf. p. 160, note 2 above.

8. Picotti, La dieta, pp. 487-8; ASF, CP, 56, fol. 141v.

And in 1461, the Archbishop of Florence excommunicated some Florentines who were engaged in trade with the infidels.¹ But despite all these difficulties, the Florentine galleys sailed to the East every year from 1459 to 1462.²

The Florentine policy of carrying on their trade in the East while continuing to support the crusade³ reached a crisis in 1463, when Venice launched an open war against the Turks. In that year the Venetians asked the Florentines not to send their galleys to Constantinople lest they be commandeered by the Sultan.⁴ But even though the Venetians went to the pope to enlist his support against the Florentine expedition, the Florentines persisted in sending the galleys.⁵ When the Venetians demanded that the galleys be recalled or at least diverted from Constantinople, warning that their own fleet was at war in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Florentines expostulated that they were sure that they would not come to harm at the hands of friends.⁶ The issue was further complicated by the pope's enthusiasm for the crusade. Encouraged by the promises made by Venice and the Duke of Burgundy, he asked the Florentines to declare their subsidy.⁷ But the Florentines were reluctant to do so,⁸

1. ASF, Missive, 43, fol. 124r-124v, 142r.

2. Mallett, Florentine Galleys, pp. 68-9; cf. F. Babinger, II, il conquistatore, e l'Italia, Rivista storica italiana, LXIII (1951), pp. 489 seq.

3. In fact, the galleys could be of use to the crusade, as in 1457 when they had transported grain from Cyprus to Rhodes during a food shortage (ASF, Miss. 41, fol. 56r-56v); later the Florentines offered to equip as many as six galleys as their subsidy for the crusade (ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 120v).

4. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 81v; ASV, Senato Secreti, XXI, fol. 143r, 154r, 186v-187r.

5. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 81v-82r; ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 118r-118v; ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 111v-112r, 113v; ASV, Senato Secreti, XXI, fol. 18v, 226v; Pastor, Ungedruckte Akten, p. 198.

6. Ibid. pp. 199-202; ASV, Senato Secreti, XXI, fol. 193v.

7. ASF, Resp. 1, fol. 116v-117r.

8. Ibid. fol. 117v; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 90r-91v; Pastor, Ungedruckte Akten, pp. 190-2; id. Storia, vol. II, p. 238.

not wanting to commit themselves while the success of the crusade was in doubt;¹ moreover, they were loath to fight alongside the Venetians, whom they resented for threatening their galleys even though it was the Venetian Empire which would reap the most benefit from a crusade.² Although their doubts about the success of the crusade eventually subsided,³ they remained adamant against giving their subsidy until the Venetians had guaranteed the safety of their galleys.⁴ But despite the remonstrances of the pope, the Venetians would not give the Florentines a clear assurance and the Florentines therefore refused to declare their subsidy.⁵

The crisis was finally surmounted through the efforts of the Duke of Milan, who convinced the Florentines to come to terms with the pope regardless of their galleys.⁶ The Florentines agreed to contribute whatever the pope and the duke saw fit,⁷ and the next year they decided not to send galleys to the East.⁸ That spring the Florentines asked the pope to send agents to collect the crusading taxes and subsequently they allowed crusading indulgences to be preached.⁹ With the proceeds they agreed to equip a contingent half the size of the Milanese one, namely, 500 infantry and 1000 cavalry for six months.¹⁰ Moreover, when

1. Pastor, Ungedr. Akten, pp. 190-2.

2. Ibid. pp. 195-9; Pius II, Commentaries, pp. 812 seq.

3. Pastor, Ungedr. Akten, p. 229.

4. Ibid. pp. 208-210, 213-6, 218-9, 226-8; ASF, El. ed Istruz., 15, fol. 198v-109v, 110v-111r.

5. Pastor, Ungedr. Akten, pp. 199-202, 213-6, 218-9, 227-8, 234-6, 240, 255, 258-9; ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 103r-108v, 109v, 110v-113r, 114r-114v, 115v, 116v-117v, 118v, 120v; ASV, Senato Secreti, XXI, fol. 199r, 204v.

6. ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 122v-123v, 129r; ibid. El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 120v, 121r, 121v, 123r.

7. ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 132v-133r.

8. Mallett, Florentine Galleys, p. 70.

9. ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 140v-141r, 144r-144v.

10. Pastor, Ungedr. Akten, pp. 178-9, 187; ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 148r-149r.

a papal legate came to Florence to buy three unfinished galleys then at Porto Pisano, he was presented with them as a gift,¹ and when the legate who was equipping the papal fleet there found that he was short of men, some prisoners were released from the Stinche to man the galleys.²

In fact, the Florentines ran into difficulties in raising their promised contingent. They had ordered the crusading taxes to be collected, appointed collectors, and posted the apostolic letters authorizing the taxes in public places; but the proceeds had been small. Plague had prevented the taxes from being collected, and preachers had not been sent to Tuscany to offer crusading indulgences.³ The death of Cosimo de' Medici made it still more difficult to organize the Florentine subsidy,⁴ and finally when Pius II himself died, the entire expedition collapsed. But clearly the Florentines had not been unwilling to assist the pope and, despite their difficulties, had made efforts to maintain their reputation as good Christians. They had, for example, been anxious to publicize their gift of galleys and wrote to their ambassador in Rome that he was to point out to the pope that, 'noi per gratificare alla sua Beatitudine come buoni figli di quella, et per tenere ogni via non solamente conservare la sua benivolenza ma acrescieri la, abbiamo deliberato donargliela (the galleys) liberamente.'⁵ They wrote to the Duke of Milan, 'et noi deliberamo concedergliene in dono liberamente per gratificare alla sua Beatitudine.'⁶ Indeed, when it came to protestations about their fundamental sympathy with the aims of the crusade they did not hesitate to make use of all the powers of rhetorical persuasion. 'Voi vi presenterete alla presentia del sancto

1. ASF, Provv. 155, fol. 9r.

2. Ibid. fol. 42v-43v.

3. ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 161r; Pastor, Storia, vol. II, p. 153; id. Ungedr. Akten, p. 324.

4. Ibid.

5. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 121r.

6. ASF, Miss. 44, fol. 123v.

padre', their ambassadors were instructed, 'et direte noi, avendo rispetto alla salute et bene della christiana religione et alla benivolenza della Santita sua verso di noi, avere deliberato concorrere in questa impresa degl'infedeli, liberamente, col parere et voluntà della sua Beatitudine come optimi suoi figliuoli et di sancta chiesa et desiderosi della salute universale di tutti e christiani.'¹

* * *

At the beginning of this chapter it was asked what role Accolti's history might have played in Florentine Eastern diplomacy, and in this connection it should be noted that the letters of the Signoria in support of the crusade that have just been pointed out, and many others similar were in fact written by Benedetto Accolti himself as first chancellor of Florence. Indeed, many passages in these official letters resemble sections of his history. For example, in the Preface of De bello Accolti speaks of the 'communem labem, nostra etate maxime auctam, quod scilicet hostes christi religionis non modo sepulchrum eius tenent, sed longe ac late suum imperium extenderunt;' in a letter of the Signoria written on 3 February 1460 (ab inc.) Accolti writes of the 'labem atque ignominiam nostri temporis, quod scilicet catholica fides pene deserta videatur.' In the same letter Accolti writes, 'quid . . . deo . . . acceptius quam . . . fideles reliquos ad idem opus pellicere, monendo atque hortando ne christi causam deserant. . .' while in his history he states, 'num exhortando monendoque pellicere posset Christianos principes, ut opus tam salubre aggrederentur.' There are similarities of themes as well as words. The public instructions to be read out at the Congress of Mantua, also written by Accolti, dwell on the cruelty of the infidels, their vices, their blasphemies, and the harm they have inflicted on Christian holy places, all frequent subjects in the history too.² These comparisons suggest that

1. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 120v.

2. ASF, Miss. 43, fol. 111v; Bibl. Laur. Codex 54,8, fol. 2r, 5v (Recueil, vol. V, pp. 530, 534). Two other examples of similarities of wording: 'nullum periculum aut laborem recusavit' (ASF, Miss. 42, fol. 130r) and 'quos nullum laborem aut periculum recusare' (Bibl. Laur. Codex 54,6, fol. 95r; Recueil, vol. V, p. 607); 'quid enim ad comunem salutem

Benedetto Accolti's history, completed as it may have been in the summer of 1464, occupied a similar place in Florentine diplomacy to the letters he wrote as chancellor. A history written by their chancellor which had the aim of exhorting Christians to fight the Turks would perhaps have enhanced their reputations as faithful Christians as much as the Florentines' gift of galleys to the crusade. The summer of 1464, moreover, would have been a particularly opportune moment for him to publish his work; for at that time the Florentines were encountering difficulties in raising their subsidy for Pius II's crusade and they would have welcomed such a confirmation of their sympathy with the pope's plans as Accolti's history could have provided.

Florentine chancellors often wrote as private persons in support of official policy. Coluccio Salutati wrote many private letters to back up Florence's diplomatic position;¹ his long Invectiva in Antonium Luschum was intended to justify Florentine conduct during their wars with Galeazzo Visconti.² In answer to charges made against Florence by the Lucchese chancellor, Leonardo Bruni wrote a defence of Florentine conduct during the Lucchese war.³ Neither was Accolti the first Florentine chancellor to write in support

utilius, quid ad illustrem gloriam maius, quid denique deo ipsi acceptius tentari potuit, quam christi militiam adversus hostes assumere?' (ASF, Miss. 43, fol. 111v) and 'quid enim est gloriosius, quid maiore dignum laude quam pro religione tuenda, pro salute humani generis bellum suscipere' (Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,6, fol. 9v; Recueil, vol. V, p. 537). For similarities of subject matter, cf. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 29v-30r and Bibl. Laur., Codex 54,6, fol. 3r-3v, 3v-4r, 4v-5r, 6r, 84-9r, 18r-18v, 19v, 26r, 43r, 45v, 50r, 75v, 79v, 87v, 88r; Recueil, vol. V, pp. 532, 533, 534, 536, 537, 544, 545, 550, 564, 566, 570, 590, 594, 600, 601.

1. Epistolario, vol. II, pp. 11-46, 146 seq., 252-264, 335 seq., 375 seq., 400 seq.

2. Ed. D. Moreni (Florence, 1826). Cf. Baron, Crisis, 1966 ed., pp. 76, 96 seq.

3. Difesa di Leonardo Bruni Aretino contro i riprensori del popolo di Firenze nella impresa di Lucca, ed. P. Guerra (nozze Guerra-Mariani) (Lucca, 1864). Cf. also Bruni, Epistolae, vol. II, pp. 43-5.

of a crusade. For early in 1455 Poggio wrote to the King of Naples urging him to lead a naval expedition against the Turks. The king had agreed to accede to the Peace of Lodi, and Poggio congratulated him for securing peace in Italy; for now the Turkish threat could be met, and with the king at the head of the navy the Sultan could be driven from Europe. He reminded the king that the glory won in a crusade was greater than any that might be gained in another war; waging a holy war was the surest path to immortality. Poggio was writing in the wake of the enthusiasm for the crusade following the Peace of Lodi, and was probably further moved by the promising negotiations between the king and the pope regarding the crusade at that time.¹ About the same time, Poggio wrote to the Emperor urging him to lead a crusade. Although he had declared he was under no illusions about his crusading spirit, he wrote to Frederick III upbraiding him for having put off his support, and warned him of the dangers which threatened if he delayed any longer. His reputation, though tarnished, might still be vindicated, if only he would now lead the expedition against the Turks.² There is no evidence that at that time the Florentines were particularly anxious to justify their conduct, and therefore, unlike Accolti's history, Poggio's letters probably did not play a part in Florence's diplomatic negotiations regarding the crusade. Nevertheless, in 1454 and 1455, the Florentine government was sympathetic to the crusade, and Poggio's letters resemble Accolti's history in their conformity to Florentine policy.

Accolti, moreover, may have been writing not only for the benefit of the Florentine government; for there were some Florentines who supported in private the attempt to launch a crusade or who were at least unwilling to op-

1. Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 158-165. For the date, cf. ibid. pp. 170-1, 173-4; Shepherd and Tonelli, Vita di Poggio, vol. II, Appendix xxiv, pp. lxix-lxxi. For the negotiations between the pope and the King of Naples, cf. Pastor, Storia, vol. I, pp. 682 seq.

2. Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 203-211; for the date, cf. ibid. p. 206; for the judgment of Poggio on Frederick III, cf. ibid. p. 249 seq.

pose Pius II's plans. The most enthusiastic advocate of a crusade in Florence was Agnolo Acciaiuoli, who wrote to Otto Niccolini, then Gonfaloniere of Justice, 'We ought to help in this undertaking against the Turks; it is necessary that we should do our duty, because it would be too greatly to our discredit if all other Christians were to act, and we alone were not to join them. . . It is necessary that you should take counsel with your own self and that you should think of what great importance this matter is, when it concerns the defence of our faith for our honour and profit.'¹ Another was Gannozzo Pitti, who in the Pratiche was exceptional for showing sympathy to Pius's plans when all other speakers were openly hostile.² It is interesting that both Acciaiuoli and Pitti were in favour of the crusade; for their families had close economic and political connections with the East. Other Florentines, such as Giuglielmo Ta-

1. Quoted from Niccolini di Camugliano, Chronicles of a Florentine Family, pp. 258-9, who does not give the original text; the letter is in the Archivio Niccolini, Florence, which is not open to the public. In his mission to Pius II in October, 1458, Acciaiuoli overstepped his commission in stating that Florence wanted to be the first to join the crusade. Cf. ASF, El. ed Istruz. 15, fol. 2v, 5v, 13r-13v and the summary of Acciaiuoli's speech in Crivelli, De expeditione, p. 98. Acciaiuoli's personal correspondence is filled with comments indicating his interest in the East and his sympathy with the crusade: cf. ASF, Carte Stroziane, ser. I, 352, fol. 63r: 'dell'andare delle galee nostre in Romania, non se n'è parla ancora. Ma credo che siano certi che le non possino andare, di che sequirà qui danno et inconvenienti assai' (dated at Florence, 27 May 1463; cf. pp. 165-6 above); 'Qui sono molto pigri a provvedere a danari della xxxma' (ASF, Carte Stroziane, ser. I, 136, fol. 28r, dated at Florence 16 June 1464; cf. above pp. 166-7); 'E venetiani sequitano in questa impresa del Turco, la quale sia cosa utile et degna, se l'Ungharo gli serve per terra' (Ibid. fol. 33v, dated at Milan 4 July 1463); cf. also ibid. fol. 29v, 30r, 32r, 33v-34r, 36r; ASF, Carte Stroziane, ser. I, 352, fol. 62r, 63r). Donato Acciaiuoli, the humanist, seems to have shared his cousin Agnolo's views. Cf. his letter ibid. fol. 66r: 'loro /i Veneziani / danno aiuto agli Ungheri per tenere occupato el Turchō di la, e per questa via è apto a riuscire loro la impresa della Morea, che sarebbe gran chosa' (dated Florence, 21 July 1463); cf. also ibid. fol. 67r.

2. Cf. p. 159, note 1 above.

nagli¹ and Giuliano Porticini² may also have been in real sympathy with the pope's plans. There were some Florentines, however, who were not so much in favour of a crusade, as anxious to remain on good terms with the pope. The most important of these was Cosimo de' Medici. At the time of the Congress of Mantua he said that he considered the pope a fool to have called the Congress.³ But when he was asked to persuade the pope to abandon his attempt, Cosimo refused; for the pope, he said, was working for the good of Christendom, and he would only prejudice his own reputation if he were to stand in his way. He did not want to be the one to speak against what the pope had done.⁴ In the *Pratiche* of 1460, there is evidence that it was Cosimo who was responsible for the volte-face of the Florentines and he continued to do what he could for the crusade in 1464:⁵ he appears to have been the one who intervened with the Signoria to release the prisoners from the Stinche to man the papal galleys,⁶ and he promised to equip a galley for the papal fleet at his own expense.⁷ There were a number of Florentines, such as Otto Niccolini, Bernardo de' Medici, and Ugolino Martelli, who were quick to succumb to Cosimo's influence,⁸ and it is not without significance that Accolti's closest friend was Otto Niccolini. Moreover, Accolti's dedication of his history to Piero di Cosimo provides a direct link between Accolti and the Medici, who were unwilling to oppose the pope. Their reputation as good Christians would have been enhanced by receiving the dedication of a work

1. ASF, CP, 55, fol. 131v.

2. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 54r.

3. Picotti, La dieta, pp. 95, 111.

4. Cf. Appendix V below.

5. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 63v-64r; cf. p. 164, note 3 above.

6. Cf. M. Morici, 'Il Cardinale Niccolò Fortequerri e Giovanni di Cosimo de' Medici', Buletino storico pistoiese, II (1900), p. 114.

7. Pius II, Commentaries, p. 848.

8. ASF, CP, 56, fol. 60r-62r.

supporting the crusade; Accolti was offering another proof that the Medici put religious sentiments before commercial interests.¹

The Medici, like other Florentines, had little to gain in supporting a crusade; but they had a great deal to lose if, by opposing it, they alienated the pope and tarnished their reputation throughout Christendom. Although it was against their commercial interests, a sense of Christian decency and their obligations to the pope impelled the Florentines to lend their support to Pius II's crusade, and Benedetto Accolti's role as historian and chancellor was to back up Florentine diplomacy with all the force of humanist rhetoric.

1. Accolti worked behind the scenes during his term of office as chancellor on other business of public interest with Cosimo de' Medici: cf. pp. 114-5 above and Appendix III below.

CHAPTER VI: ACCOLTI'S DE BELLO AND THE CLASSICAL TRADITION OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

In ancient literature the principles of historiography were a favourite subject of discussion; whether history more closely resembled oratory or poetry, what style best befitted historical prose, who was best qualified to be an historian, what kind of sources were most reliable -- such were the questions at hand. Almost everyone had his own theory: there were the 'tragic' and the 'rhetorical' schools, there were the followers of Caesar, of Sallust, and of Cicero.¹ From this interchange of ideas two precepts may be singled-out which had a particularly strong influence on later historical writing. One is that the aim of history is truth; the other, that history should be written in an elevated literary style.

Cicero called history the 'lux veritatis' and declared its 'first law to be that an author must not dare to tell anything but the truth'.² That was a common assumption about history in antiquity:³ truth was one of the standards by which historical works were judged. Pliny the Younger said his uncle was a 'religiosissimus' historian;⁴ Quintilian noted that Clitarchus was considered untrustworthy;⁵

1. On Latin historiographical theory, cf. J. F. D'Alton, Roman Literary Theory and Criticism (London, 1931), pp. 491 seq.; A. D. Leeman, Orationis ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers (Amsterdam, 1963); M. Rambaud, Cicéron et l'histoire romaine (Paris, 1953); P. G. Walsh, Livy (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 20 seq.; V. Paladini, Sallustio (Milan, 1948), pp. 103-184; A. H. McDonald, 'The Roman Historians', in Fifty Years -- and Twelve -- of Classical Scholarship, ed. M. Platnauer (Oxford, 1954), pp. 465-495; B. L. Ullman, 'History and Tragedy', Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, LXXIII (1942), pp. 25-53; F. W. Walbank, 'Tragic History: a Reconsideration', Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London, II (1955), pp. 4 seq.

2. De oratore, II, 36, 62.

3. E.g. Cicero, Ad fam. V, xii, 3; Pliny, Ep. VII, 33.

4. Ep. V, 8.

5. Quintilian, X, 1, 75.

Pompeius Trogus criticized Livy and Sallust for exceeding the 'historiae modum' by including fictitious speeches in their works.¹ Truth was sometimes seen as the quality which distinguished history from other literary genres, such as poetry and oratory.² It was a standard for selecting evidence: Livy pointed to the difference between the early legends surrounding the foundation of Rome and historical fact,³ and Quintilian observed that Greek historians often used poetic license when they included fables in their histories.⁴ In providing his friend Tacitus with a description of his uncle's death, Pliny assured him that his account was based on what he himself had witnessed or had learnt immediately after the event.⁵ The historian was supposed to be unbiased too: according to Cicero he must tell the whole truth without partiality or malice,⁶ and those sentiments were echoed by Sallust and Livy with regard to their own works.⁷ An historian was not only judged according to whether he presented facts in history, but also how many facts and what kind of facts: hence arose the pursuit of erudition in antiquity. Cicero praised Timaeas as 'eruditissimus'; he and Thucydides were outstanding for their copia rerum'.⁸

The ancients, thus, had a clear notion that truth was the essence of history, and they had certain criteria for determining the validity of evidence. Complementary or at times contradictory to these ideas was the desire to make of history a literary pursuit. Cicero found fault with the bland style of the annalists while praising the eloquence of the

1. Apud Justinum, XXXVIII, iii, 11.

2. Cicero, Brutus, 42-3; id. De legibus, I, 5.

3. Praef. to lib. I, 6.

4. II, iv, 19.

5. Pliny, Ep. VI, 16.

6. De oratore, II, 62.

7. Livy, Praef. to lib. I, 5; Sallust, Bellum Cat., IV, 2.

8. De oratore, II, 56, 58.

Greek historians.¹ He criticized recent Roman historians such as Antipater or Asellio for their roughness,² and on one occasion Quintilian even took Livy to task for verbosity.³ History was thought to require the artistry of the orator; according to Cicero, history was a 'munus . . . oratoris'.⁴ The same style, however, was not considered suitable for oratory and history. Quintilian called history a prose poem (carmen solutum); its purpose was narration, not proof and to allay monotony the historian should use more figures of speech and unusual words than the orator.⁵ History should flow along gently; oratory should be forceful and intense.⁶ According to Cicero, the rough speech and stinging epigrams of oratory were unsuited to the gliding ease of history.⁷ Thucydides, Cicero admitted, was grave and sublime, and Xenophon, sweeter than honey; but their style was ill-adapted to the wrangling of the forum.⁸ Similarly, Sallust's brevitas and Livy's lactea ubertas, according to Quintilian, were appropriate to history, but could hardly be used to convince an uneducated audience.⁹ Instead of the style of forensic oratory historians were told to imitate the simple, unornamented elegance of Caesar's Commentaries,¹⁰ or the sublimity and energy of Thucydides and Sallust,¹¹ or the

1. Ibid. II, 53-8.

2. Ibid. 54; De legibus, I, 6-7.

3. VIII, iii, 53.

4. De oratore, II, 62. Cf. De legibus, I, 5.

5. X, i, 31.

6. Quintilian, IX, 4, 18.

7. De oratore, II, 64. Cf Pliny, Ep. V, 8, on which Leeman, Oratoris ratio, I, pp. 336-7; but I find Leeman's reinterpretation of this ambiguous passage in Pliny unconvincing. Cf. also Cicero, Orator, 66, 68.

8. Ibid. 31-2.

9. Quintilian, X, i, 32-3; cf. also IV, ii, 45.

10. Cf. Cicero, Brutus, 262; id. Ad Atticum, II, 1.

11. Cf. Orator, 31, 39; Quintilian, IV, ii, 45 and X, i, 32-3, 73, 101.

easy flow of Livy and Herodotus.¹ Eloquence made history into the 'magistra vitae',² provided its moral authority. According to Asellio, 'annals cannot in any way make men more eager to defend their country, or more reluctant to do wrong.'³

Regarded in this light, however, history might become no more than a vehicle for literary effects; the historian might come to care more for giving pleasure to his readers, for rousing their emotions or stimulating their interests than for truth. Hence arose in antiquity the school of rhetorical or tragic history. Cicero asked the historian Luceius to write such as history of his own consulate. 'What has happened to me,' he wrote, 'will supply you with an infinite variety of material, abounding in a sort of pleasurable interest which could powerfully grip the attention of the reader. . . the regular chronological record of events in itself (ordo ipse annalium) interests us as little as if it were a catalogue of historical occurrences; but the uncertain and varied fortunes of a statesman who frequently rises to prominence give scope for surprise, suspense, delight, annoyance, hope, fear; should those fortunes, however, end in some striking consummation the result is a complete satisfaction of mind which is the most perfect pleasure a reader can enjoy. . . this drama (fabula), if I may so call it, of my own particular actions and experiences . . . contains a variety of acts and scenes (actiones) in the way of political measures and situations.' And earlier Cicero had said that he made so bold as to 'ask you again and again to eulogize my actions with even more warmth than you feel, and in that respect to disregard the canons of history (leges historiae neglegas) . . . if you find that such personal partiality enhances my merits even to exaggeration in your eyes, I ask you not to disdain it, and of your bounty to bestow on our love even a little more than

1. Orator, 39; Quintilian, X, i, 32-3, 73, 101.

2. De oratore, II, 36.

3. Apud Gellium V, xviii, 9, tr. J.C. Rolfe, Loeb Classical Library, (London, 1927), vol. I, p. 435.

may be allowed by truth.'¹

These precepts about history were handed down from antiquity to the middle ages. William of Malmsbury, for example, in the preface of his Gesta regum, distinguished between eye-witness or contemporary accounts, and hearsay evidence. 'I do not vouch for the truth of my account of past events,' he wrote, 'but only for the accuracy of the dates; my sources themselves will have to answer for the version of events. Whatever I have included from the recent past, however, I have either witnessed myself or have had from trustworthy persons.' Similarly, Gervase of Canterbury said that the aim of the historian and the chronicler was truth. But he went on to point out the differences in style between a history and a chronicle. 'An historian's language,' he said 'is effusive and elegant, a chronicler's, simple and concise. . . The historian should captivate his audience by his suave and elegant style.'²

The classical tradition provided the groundwork for historiographical theory in the Renaissance too. A little known treatise on history by Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger, written in the form of a letter to Flavio Biondo on 8 April 1437, can serve to set forth some of the ideas

1. Ad familiares, V, 12, tr. W. Glynn Williams, Loeb Classical Library. (London, 1943), vol. I, pp. 368-373.

2. De gestis Regum Anglorum, libri quinque, ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1887-89), vol. I, p. 3: 'menihil de retroactis praeter cohaerentiam annorum pro vero pacisci; fides dictorum penes auctores erit. Quicquid vero de recentioribus aetatibus opposui, vel ipse vidi vel a viris fide dignis audivi.' Gervase of Canterbury, Opera Historica, ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1879-80), vol. I, p. 87: 'Historici autem et cronici secundum aliquid una est intentio et materia, sed diversus tractandi modus est et forma varia. Utriusque una est intentio, quia uterque veritati intendit. Forma tractandi varia, quia historicus diffuse et eleganter incedit, cronicus vero simpliciter graditur et breviter. . . Proprium est historici veritati intendere, audientes vel legentes dulci sermone et eleganti demulcere. . .'. For similar ideas about history, cf. William of Tyre, Historia, in Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux (Paris, 1844-95), vol. I, p. 3; Fulcher Carnotensis, Historia hierosolymitana, ibid. vol. III, p. 320; Rudolfus Cadomensis, Gesta Tancredi, ibid. p. 603; Robert of St Remy, Historia Iherosolimitana, ibid. pp. 721-3.

about historiography held during the early Renaissance,¹ and in particular, by the circle of humanists gathered around the Curia, with whom Benedetto Accolti is known to have been associated.² Lapo pointed to the eloquence of history, to its 'summa dicendi vis'.³ Histories in antiquity were 'libri copiosissime elegantissimeque conscripti';⁴ the great deeds of men would be 'omnia incognita, nisi eloquentissimi viri litteris memoriaeque prodidissent'.⁵ History, according to Lapo, provides examples which stir men to the pursuit of virtue and deter them from the path of vice;⁶ it assures them that their virtuous, as well as their wicked deeds will be remembered.⁷ Lapo goes on to paraphrase the lines from De oratore in which Cicero distinguishes historical style from that of forensic oratory; at the end of the passage Lapo adds a few ideas in a similar vein, which reveal some of the preoccupations of humanists attempting to write history in an elegant, classical manner. Every idea should be expressed by 'propriis, aptis latinisque verbis', by which Lapo meant words that would have been chosen by a classical author. Nothing should seem out of place or unnatural: 'nihil claudicare, nihil offendi, nihil animadverti possit, nihil denique insit, quod peregrinum sonare aut redolere videatur'; that is, nothing should seem in-

1. Biblioteca Vaticana, codex Ottob. Lat. 1677, fol. 208v-217v (saec. xv). The treatise was first noticed by F.P. Luiso, 'Studi su l'epistolario e le traduzioni di Lapo da Castiglione Junior', Studi italiani di filologia classica, VII (1899), pp. 245-6; R. Fubini in 'Flavio Biondo', for the Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, vol. X, p. 543, briefly mentions it, but mistakenly cites codex 1667 instead of 1677.

2. Cf. above, p. 55.

3. Cod. Ottob. Lat. 1677, fol. 210v.

4. Ibid. fol. 215r.

5. Ibid. fol. 213v.

6. Ibid. fol. 210v-211v; 212v-213v.

7. Ibid. fol. 213v-214r.

consistent with classical Latin style.¹ In particular Lapo praised Leonardo Bruni's History for its elegantia, copia, and suavitas, and compared it to Biondo's Decades.² In that work Biondo wrote as gracefully as the ancients themselves;³ he had restored the Latin language, which had fallen into decay, to its pristine state of elegance.⁴ Thus Lapo adopted the classical precept that history should be written in an elevated literary style.

Lapo also expounded the notion found in classical historiographical theory that history is concerned with fact, that its purpose is to reveal the truth. He again turns to De oratore, from which he paraphrases the passage in which Cicero states that the first law of history is truth, that the historian should be unbiased. Lapo goes on to praise the historian who is careful in his selection of evidence, who includes only what he himself has witnessed or has heard from reliable witnesses.⁵ Lapo probably did not take these

1. Lapo (ibid. fol. 216r):
Genus autem ipsum orationis,
quale est, dii boni! quam
fusum ac tractum, quam sine
illis salebris, quam non vas-
te, non hiulce neque prae-
postere, non contorter, sed
leniter fluens; a forensibus
aculeis et iudiciali asper-
itate seiunctum; tum pro-
priis aptis latinisque ver-
bis unquamque rem explicans.
In quo nihil claudicare, ni-
hil offendere, nihil animad-
verti possit; nihil denique
insit, quod peregrinum sonari
aut redolere videatur.

De oratore, II, 64:
Verborum autem ratio et
genus orationis fusum at-
que tractum et cum leni-
tate quadam aequabili pro-
fluens, sine hac iudiciali
asperitate, et sine sen-
tentiarum forensium acu-
leis persequendum est.

2. Ibid. fol. 210r.

3. Ibid. fol. 215v, 216r.

4. Ibid. fol. 216v.

5. Lapo (ibid. fol. 215v-6r):
Nam quae sunt primum hys-
toricis quasi impositae le-
ges, ut ne quid falsum admis-
cere audebant; ne quid verum
praetermittant; ne invidia,
gratia, metu, spe, odio, cu-
piditate a vera ac recta
sententia deducantur: abste

De oratore, II, 62-3:
Nam quis nescit, primam
esse historiae legem, ne
auid falsi dicere audeat?
Deinde ne quid veri non
audeat? Ne qua suspicio
gratiae sit in scribendo?
Ne qua simultatis? Haec
scilicet fundamenta nota

ideas about evidence from any classical Latin source;¹ he may have used a Greek source such as Polybius or Lucianus' De historia conscribenda, but it seems more likely he derived them from the conversations which he mentions in the letter he had had with Biondo², who is known to have placed emphasis in the Decades on the importance of eye-witness and contemporary evidence.³ At any rate, such criteria were

diligentissime conservatae sunt. Nam et ipse ut opinor interfuisti rebus gerendis et, quibus minus interfuisses, eas investigando et perconcitando ab his apud quos gestae essent didicisti. E quibus locupletissimis testibus niterentur, pro veris probasti; que vero sermonem vulgi auctorem minoremque haberent, ut falsa ac ficta ommisisti. Deinde ea sine quibus hystoria illustris non esse potest, ordinem temporum, locorum descriptiones, tum consilia, acta, eventus, miro artificio persecutus es; ut quod probandum videretur summa gravitate probares, quod improbandum sine cupiditate damnares. Nec solum quid actum gestumve, sed etiam quo pacto, quodque gestum foret exponeres. Causasque rerum omnium peritissime in medium proferres, quid casus attulerit, quid invidia conflarit, quid error affixerit, quid sapientia providerit, quid temeritas attentarit. Sermones praeterea, congressus, contionesque habitas, rogata, responsa, cuique servata personarum dignitate attribueres, quae significant prudentiam scriptoris et diligentiam et ipsam probabilem hystoriam reddunt.

sunt omnibus; ipsa autem exaedicatio posita est in rebus et verbis. Rerum ratio ordinem temporum desiderat, regionum descriptionem, vult etiam, quoniam in rebus magnis memoriaque dignis consilia primum, deinde acta, postea eventus expectentur, et de consiliis significari quid scriptor probet, et in rebus gestis declarari, non solum quid actum aut dictum sit, sed etiam quomodo; et cum de eventu dicatur, et causae explicentur omens, vel casus, vel sapientiae, vel temeritatis, hominumque ipsorum non solum res gestae, sed etiam qui fama ac nomine excellant, de cuiusque vita atque natura.

1. The only possibility would be Pliny, Ep. VI, 16.

2. Cod. Ottob. Lat. 1677, fol. 209v.

3. Cf. codex Vaticanus Latinus, 1795 (saec. xii-xiii), a copy of Paul the Deacon's History of the Lombards, annotated by Biondo, fol. 66v: 'Nota auctor proximus fuit his temporibus' (as indicated by B. Nogara, in Scritti inediti, p. cvii); cf. also Decades, pp. 223, 227.

part of the common stock of medieval ideas about historiography¹ and it is noteworthy that Lapo considers them sufficiently important to warrant interrupting his paraphrase of De oratore in order to include them.

Unlike Cicero's letter to Lucceius, Lapo's treatise does not reveal how the humanists in their histories set about giving to eloquence and truth each their due. For that one has to turn to the practice of historiography in the Renaissance and to the study of the use to which the humanist historians put their sources. In particular, this chapter will consider how Benedetto Accolti reconciled the requirements of truth and eloquence in his *History of the First Crusade*.

* * * * *

It is well known that the main source of Accolti's De bello was William of Tyre's Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum.² William wrote his history in Latin, but it was mainly known in the middle ages not in the original Latin version but in a French translation. The original Latin text survives in only nine manuscripts³ but the French translation, in seventy-one.⁴ Indeed, the original Latin text was so little known in the middle ages, that Latin translations of the French version were undertaken.⁵ In Italy in particular during the later middle ages there is evidence to suggest that William of Tyre's history was mainly known in the French version. The Bolognese Pipino's history was a Latin translation of an abbreviated version of

1. Cf. p. 178, above.

2. Cf. E. Fueter, Storia della storiografia moderna, tr. A. Spinelli (Naples, 1944), vol. 1, p. 28; Recueil, vol. V, p. cxxxv.

3. Cf. A.C. Krey, Introduction to the English translation of William of Tyre's History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea (New York, 1943), vol. I, p. 39.

4. Cf. P. Riant, 'Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits de l'Éracles', Archives de l'Orient latin, I (1881), pp. 247-256.

5. Ibid. p. 253.

the French translation of William of Tyre.¹ In 1348 a Florentine citizen called Lorenzo made an Italian translation of the entire French version of William of Tyre.² And Flavio Biondo in his Decades seems to have consulted the French version of William; for at one point he refers to him as 'Guilelmus et ipse scriptor Gallicus'.³ As William was born and died in the East,⁴ Biondo would have had no reason to associate him with France unless he had read his history in French.

Vespasiano da Bisticci stated that Accolti knew French and was able to base De bello on a number of French chronicles.⁵ Textual comparisons bear out that Accolti used the French translation, not the original Latin version, of William of Tyre in his history. Introducing Peter the Hermit, Accolti describes him as 'magno ingenio, maiore animo peditus',⁶ a translation of the French 'de grant cuer et de cler engin'.⁷ During Peter's march to the East Accolti says he ordered his men not to attack Nish 'suo ac principum nomine',⁸ again a translation of the French 'de par soi et de par les barons de l'ost'.⁹ Similarly, during Tancred's quarrel with Baldwin of Bouillon, Accolti says that Tancred

1. Ibid.; M.L. de Mas Latrie, 'Essai de classification des continuateurs de l'Histoire des croisades de Guillaume de Tyr', Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartres, v^e série, I (1860), pp. 145-9. Published by L. Muratori, Rerum italicarum scriptores, VII (Milan, 1725), col. 657 seq.

2. Preserved in Codex Laurentianus, Plut. 61,45; it is clear from the opening sentences that Lorenzo was translating the French, not the Latin version of William of Tyre: cf. ibid. fol. 12r with Recueil, vol. I, p. 9.

3. Decades, p. 216.

4. Cf. Krey, Introduction to William of Tyre, p. 6.

5. Vite, ed. A. Greco, p. 597.

6. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 5r; Recueil, V, p. 534.

7. Recueil, I, p. 32; the Latin text reads: 'major in exiguu regnabat corpore virtus. Vivacis enim ingenii erat.' (Ibid.)

8. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16r; Recueil, V, p. 542.

9. Recueil, I, p. 54; Latin version: 'praecepit districtius, ut nemo. . .' (Ibid.)

yielded to Baldwin, iram dissimulans,¹ which is closer to the French 'il couvri sa penssée' than to the Latin 'motum animi temperans.'² The French version is not a literal translation of the Latin text; the translator often omitted, changed or added details, so that Accolti's account, based on the French translation, sometimes diverges from the Latin original not only in matters of language, but also of fact. Thus Accolti states that Urban II instructed Peter the Hermit to preach the crusade in the West before the Council of Clermont,³ a detail only found in the French version.⁴ Similarly Accolti derives from the French version his account of the humiliation of the emperor Romanus Diogenes after the battle of Manzikert in 1071: they both state that the victorious Sultan used the Emperor's neck to mount his horse, whereas according to the Latin version his entire body was used.⁵ Accolti's statement that Nicephorus Phocas was being held prisoner by Alexius I at the time of the First Crusade is also taken from the French, not the Latin version.⁶

It might be wondered whether Accolti used the manuscript of the French translation of William preserved today in the Biblioteca Laurenziana (Plut. 61,10, saec. xiii). There is no evidence that this manuscript was in Florence during the fifteenth century, nor that it was part of the

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 44r; Recueil, V, p. 565.

2. Recueil, I, p. 142.

3. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7r; Recueil, V, p. 535.

4. Cf. Recueil, I, pp. 37-8.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 18r (Recueil, V, p. 544) with Recueil, I, p. 28.

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 18v (Recueil, V, p. 544) with Recueil, I, p. 79. Some other examples: cf. Accolti's account of Peter the Hermit's embassy to Nish, Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16r (Recueil, V, p. 542) with Recueil, I, p. 54; his account of the beginnings of the siege of Nicea, Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 34v (Recueil, V, p. 557) with Recueil, I, p. 117; his account of the capture of the messengers to Nicea, Bibl. Laur. Cod. 54,6 fol. 36v (Recueil, V, p. 559) with Recueil, I, p. 114; his account of Godfrey of Bouillon's heroism during an assault on Nicea, Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 38v (Recueil, V, p. 560) with Recueil, I, p. 122.

original Medici collection.¹ Textual comparison bears out that Accolti did not use this particular manuscript: Accolti says that Peter the Hermit's army spent eight days travelling from Belgrade to Nish;² other manuscripts of the French translation agree with this number,³ but the Laurentian codex gives a variant reading of seven days.⁴ Flavio Biondo in the Decades made use of Pipino's Latin translation of the French version of William of Tyre⁵ and it might be wondered whether Accolti also made use of this version of the French translation. Pipino's version, however, is abbreviated, and did not supply all the details which Accolti was able to take from the French translation. For example, Accolti's history contains a full account of the march of Peter the Hermit's army to Constantinople⁶ which includes many details taken from the complete French translation⁷ not found in Pipino's summary.⁸ It has been suggested that Accolti may have used the Italian translation of the French version of William of Tyre done by Lorenzo Fiorentino in 1348.⁹ Unlike Pipino's summary it is a literal translation of the complete French version, even to the point of including Gallicisms in the text.¹⁰ However, the manuscript was not part of the Medici collection during

1. Cf. Piccolomini, Intorno alla condizione, pp. 67 seq.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 14v; Recueil, V, p. 541.

3. Recueil, I, p. 51.

4. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 61, 10, fol. 19v.

5. Cf. P. Buchholz, Die Quellen der Historiarum Decades Flavii Biondis (Naumburg, 1881), pp. 80-1.

6. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fols. 14r-17r; Recueil, V, pp. 541-3.

7. Recueil, I, pp. 50-6.

8. Rerum italicarum scriptores, vol. VII, col. 671-2.

9. Cf. Recueil, V, p. cxxxvi.

10. It is not a corrupted version of William of Tyre, as is stated ibid.

the fifteenth century,¹ and textual comparison shows that it was not the version of the French translation used by Accolti. For example, Accolti stated that the men from Nish were the best soldiers in their country;² in the French text it is also said that they were 'de totes les meilleurs genz de la terre',³ but Lorenzo merely said they were 'buona gente',⁴ Another example is the episode of the mills near Nish that were burnt by some of Peter the Hermit's followers: Accolti's and the French version agree that the malefactors were German⁵, but Lorenzo merely says, 'In quella compangnia avea ii che molto erano mafacienti,' with no mention of their nationality.⁶

It is significant that Accolti used the French translation of William of Tyre, rather than the Latin original, as his main source. For the translation was a very different work from William's original history. It is far less sophisticated: it is a popularization written for a wider audience; and it has many elements borrowed from the chansons de geste. The translator omitted William's prologue about the aims of history, and except for the Church Fathers, he left out quotations from classical authors. He shortened geographical descriptions, summarized speeches, and abbreviated accounts of battles.⁷ In other words, the translator omitted or passed over many of the elements of William's history that would have interested a humanist such as Accolti attempting to write a classicized history. The original version of William's history is one of the masterpieces of literary history in the twelfth century. Accolti clearly

1. Cf. Piccolomini, Intorno alla condizione, pp. 67 seq.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 14v; Recueil, V, p. 541.

3. Recueil, I, p. 51.

4. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 61, 45, fol. 21r.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 15r (Recueil, V, p. 541), with Recueil, I, p. 52.

6. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 61,45, fol. 21r.

7. Cf. Franz Ost, Die altfranzösische Übersetzung der Geschichte der Kreuzzüge Wilhelms von Tyrus (Halle a. S., 1899), pp. 27 seq.

had works such as the French translation in mind, when in the Preface to De bello he said 'libros. . . gesta eorum continentes qui Christi sepulchrum Iudeamque omnem recuperarunt, inepte scriptos absque ornatu orationis, atque ideo paucis notos.'¹ It is no wonder that Accolti turned for supplementary material to other chronicles; for the French translation of William was insufficient for his purposes.

After William of Tyre, Accolti's main source was Robert of St Remy's Historia iherosylimitana, a work well known in the later middle ages.² One example of Accolti's use of Robert is the homage sworn by the crusaders to the Byzantine emperor, Alexius I. William of Tyre does not discuss the oaths taken by the crusaders but Robert devotes a long section to them, upon which Accolti's account is based.³ During the siege of Antioch the besieged citizens put a number of horses out to pasture beyond the city; these were captured by the crusaders, 'que res,' said Accolti, 'vehementer fregit hostium animos,'⁴ a paraphrase of Robert's 'quod infortunium cives vehementer attrivit.'⁵ Just before the crusading army was to engage Kerbogha, the general who had been sent to reconquer Antioch, Accolti said that the Papal Legate, Adhemar of Monteil, Bishop of Le Puy, addressed the host;⁶ he was not mentioned as giving a speech on this occasion by William of Tyre, but Robert did include an account of his speech.⁷ Another example is Accolti's description of Caesarea in Judaea, which is based on Robert.⁸

These passages Accolti took directly from Robert of

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 1v; Recueil, V, p. 530.

2. Cf. Recueil, III, p. 718.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31v (Recueil, V, p. 555) with Recueil, III, pp. 748-50.

4. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 60r-60v; Recueil, V, p. 578

5. Recueil, III, p. 793.

6. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 67r; Recueil, V, p. 583-4.

7. Recueil, III, p. 829.

8. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 85v (Recueil, V, pp. 598-9) and Recueil, III, p. 858.

St Remy's history. Most parts of De bello based on material from Robert, however, were not taken directly, but through an intermediate source: Marin Sanudo's Liber secretorum fidelium crucis, of which many sections treating of the First Crusade were based on Robert of St Remy. An example of Accolti's use of Sanudo is his discussion of the Council of Clermont. Accolti might have derived from either Sanudo or Robert that Pope Urban II delivered his oration outside the city¹ or that there was a council held on the day after the pope's speech.² However, Robert does not mention the reforms of the council of Clermont nor the measures enacted there against the anti-pope, both details which Accolti derived from Sanudo.³ Nor does Robert mention that on the very day of Urban II's oration many pledged themselves to follow the Crusade, as do Accolti and Sanudo.⁴ Robert moreover does not make clear that it was at the council on the day after Urban II's oration that Adhemar of Monteil was elected Papal legate, another detail which Accolti derives from Sanudo.⁵

Accolti's use of Sanudo as a source for De bello raises another problem. Sanudo's account of the First Crusade in the Liber secretorum was a combination of two earlier chronicles, those of Robert of St Remy and William of Tyre. It may be wondered whether Accolti's work was merely a revised version of Sanudo's, only relying indirectly on Robert and William. It has been pointed out above that there are passages in De bello which are based directly on Robert's

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7v (Recueil, V, p. 536) with Recueil, III, p. 727 and Sanudo, in Gesta dei per Francos, sive Orientalium expeditionum historia, ed. J. Bongars (Hanoviae, 1611), vol. II, p. 131.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11r (Recueil, V, p. 538) with Recueil, III, p. 730 and Sanudo, p. 131.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7v (Recueil, V, pp. 535-6) with Sanudo, p. 131.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11r (Recueil, V, p. 538) with Sanudo, p. 131.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11v (Recueil, V, p. 539) with Sanudo, p. 131.

chronicle.¹ But whereas Accolti took most of the material based on Robert's history from Sanudo, he usually made direct use of William of Tyre. For example Sanudo only gives an abbreviated account of how the stragglers from Walter the Penniless' army were robbed by the Hungarians; and whereas Accolti and William say that the victims themselves returned to the main army bringing news of the disaster,² Sanudo merely says that 'hoc. . .ad sociorum devenisset notitiam'.³ Similarly, while Walter's troops were near Belgrade, Sanudo simply states that some of them were killed by the natives;⁴ Accolti derives his more detailed account from William, who had said that first a group of crusaders were attacked, then those who survived fled, and finally some of them who had taken refuge in huts were burnt alive by the natives.⁵ Sanudo's version of William of Tyre was only a summary and would have been much too abbreviated for Accolti's purposes.

It might be asked why Accolti bothered with Sanudo's history, when he had at hand the chronicles upon which it was based. Pliny the Younger had said that in writing the history of an age long past, the great difficulty was collating the various chronicles.⁶ Narrative history, in the absence of comprehensive chronologies and reference works, was no easy task. It must have been difficult even to determine when chronicles were narrating the same event. It could have been a great help to an historian, therefore, to find a predecessor who had already done the collation, and had determined the sequence of events in the sources. Such a predecessor Accolti was fortunate enough to find in Sanudo. Accolti used Sanudo as a type of cicerone along the often

1. No mention is made by Sanudo of the details cited above on p. 187.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13r (Recueil, V, p. 540) with Recueil, I, p. 48.

3. Sanudo, p. 132.

4. Ibid.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13r-13v (Recueil, V, p. 540) with Recueil, I, pp. 48-9.

6. Ep. V,8.

obscure paths of the First Crusade. Thus for example at the beginning of De bello Accolti follows William of Tyre's account in narrating Peter the Hermit's pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Rome, just as Sanudo had done in his Liber secretorum.¹ Then when Sanudo turns to Robert of St Remy for his account of the Council of Clermont, Accolti does the same.² And after the Council Accolti again follows Sanudo in turning from Robert back to William.³ Another example may be taken from the end of Book One of De bello. In narrating the events of Gottschalk's crusade, Accolti, like Sanudo, follows William of Tyre.⁴ Then he follows Sanudo's collation of William of Tyre and Robert of St Remy at the end of the expedition of Raymond of Toulouse, the Bishop of Le Puy, Bohemond and Hugh the Great.⁵

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 5r-7r (Recueil, V, pp. 534-5) and Sanudo, pp. 130-1 with Recueil, I, pp. 32-8.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7r-11v (Recueil, V, pp. 535-9) and Sanudo, p. 131 with Recueil, III, pp. 727 seq.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 12v seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 540 seq.) and Sanudo, pp. 131 seq. with Recueil, I, pp. 47 seq.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 21v-23v (Recueil, V, pp. 547-8) and Sanudo, p. 135 with Recueil, I, pp. 63-8.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 23v-27v (Recueil, V, pp. 548-551) and Sanudo, p. 135 with Recueil, III, pp. 739-42. It has been suggested that Accolti used Albert of Aix's chronicle as a source for the passage in De bello treating of the massacre of the German members of Peter the Hermit's army at the hands of Kilij Arslan (Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 19v; Recueil, V, p. 545). It is true that Accolti gives a more complete account of this episode than William of Tyre (cf. Recueil, I, pp. 59-60) and that William's account, based on Albert's, is abbreviated. But a glance at the two texts will show that Accolti's version bears no relation to Albert's. (Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 19v / Recueil, V, p. 545 / with Recueil, IV, p. 286) Another suggested source for part of De bello is the chronicle of Guibertus de Novigento, who, like Accolti (Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11v-12r; Recueil, V, p. 539) spoke of a council held in France to plan the expedition shortly before the departure of the crusaders (Recueil, IV, p. 149). It is unlikely, however, that Accolti used Guibertus as a source. In the first place, I have found no other examples of Accolti's use of Guibertus. Secondly, the similarity between Accolti and Guibertus is only a very general one: the only detail on which they agree is that the congress was held in France. All other details in Accolti's account -- the

The choice of sources Accolti made for De bello is significant, for they saved him from having to undertake any considerable amount of historical spade work. His subject was one in which the collation of the best known chronicles had already been accomplished. He seems not to have cared for reconstructing a period of history out of obscure and incomplete accounts. His interest was not with the bones of history: he was not attracted to ferreting out and organizing the details of history. Nor was history for Accolti the pursuit of erudition: he was not much interested in bringing to light unknown historical facts. Similarly, his choice of sources shows that he was not particular how reliable were the facts that he did include. Accolti used as his main source William of Tyre's history, which was written in the second half of the twelfth century, more than fifty years after the events of the First Crusade. The history of Robert of St Remy, who was a contemporary of the First Crusade and had even taken part in the events described, Accolti only used as a secondary source. Moreover, most of the time he did not take the trouble to use Robert's history at first hand, but rather employed an intermediary, Sanudo's Liber secretorum, written at the beginning of the fourteenth century. The humanists had emphasized the importance of eye-witness accounts and accuracy of sources,¹ but

crusaders present, the decision to set out in the spring, the decision to divide the army -- are not found in Guibertus. Guibertus, moreover, had said that the King of France attended the congress, and it would have been strange for Accolti deliberately to omit such a leading personality. The decision of the council to divide the army in De bello is clearly derived from William of Tyre or Sanudo (cf. Recueil, I, p. 46 and Sanudo, p. 132) who say that the barons agreed to divide the army, from which Accolti may have deduced that there had been a council. Councils were an important part of ancient historiography (cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 204-8) and Accolti may simply have invented the council in order to classicize his history. It has also been suggested that Accolti made use of Jacques de Vitry's history (cf. B.R. Reynolds, 'Latin Historiography: a Survey 1400-1600', in Studies in the Renaissance, II (1955), p. 14) but I have found no evidence for this.

1. Cf. pp. 180-1 above.

in Accolti's case the gap between theory and practice was great. He did not use Robert of St Remy's chronicle in preference to later accounts, and when he did use it, it was usually at second hand.

Accolti's procedure in selecting his sources for De bello stands in contrast to that of Biondo in the sections of the Decades treating of the history of the First Crusade. Biondo had access to both William of Tyre and Robert of St Remy,¹ but unlike Accolti, he used Robert, not William, as his main source.² And unlike Accolti, he used Robert directly, not through an intermediary; moreover, there is evidence that Biondo chose Robert as his main source because he was an eye-witness: he makes a point of saying that Robert was present at the siege of Aleppo and was therefore able to give a description of the siege engines;³ and he points out that while William and other historians exaggerate the numbers of dead resulting from the capture of Jerusalem, Robert, who was present at the siege, did not mention how many were killed.⁴ Biondo, therefore, was aware that some of his sources were more valuable than others, and used them according to their value, whereas Accolti, even if he was aware that Robert was a better source than William, still used William in preference to Robert.

Nevertheless, the gap between Accolti and Biondo should not be exaggerated; for even Biondo's care in his use of sources was limited. In this connection it may be interesting to consider whether Accolti used one source to verify the others. As an illustration of his methods, the passage narrating the beginnings of the expedition of Raymond of Toulouse, Adhemar of Monteil and Bohemond may be taken:

1. Cf. Buchholz, Die Quellen, pp. 76-81.

2. Ibid. p. 77.

3. Decades, p. 223.

4. Ibid. p. 227.

Accolti

duces erant legatus pontificis, Niciensis presul, Ugo, regis Francorum frater, et duo simul presentantes viri, quorum alter Normandi provincie, alter Flandrie dominabatur. His quoque se addiderat comitem Divi Egidii urbis princeps, qui, christianam salutem quam ipsas opes potiore ducens, patrimonia sua venundederat, quo expeditius cumulatusque Christi obsequio inhereret.

Sanudo

Hugo Magnus frater Regis Franciae, comitesque Normandiae et Flandriae, ac caeteri, aliud iter arripiunt. In alia vero societate fuere Episcopus Podiensis, et Raymundus Sancti Egidii Comes. Vir enim iste cum praedives esset omnia bona sua vendidit, ut toto conatu Christi negotio inserviret.

Robert

Interea, dum haec aguntur, de remotis occidentalium partibus, a parte Aquilonis, excitavit Dominus comites duos quibus unum nomen, una consanguinitas, aequa potestas, idem vigor et armis et animis, etiam gloria consulatus compares: Nortmannus scilicet et Flandrensis comes; cum quibus Hugo Magnus, frater Philippi, regis Francorum, qui ipso tempore Franciam suo subjugabat imperio. Hic honestate morum, et elegantia corporis, et animi virtute, regalem de qua ortus erat commendabat prosapiam; cum quo et Stephanus Carnotensis comes, qui a bonis initiis pravos deinceps obtinuit exitus. O quam innumeri optimates et minoris famae consules cum his sunt associati, tam ejusdem Franciae quam majoris et minoris Britanniae. A parte australi mota sunt castra Podiensis episcopi et comitis Sancti Aegidii, nomine Raimundi. Vir iste praedives esset et temporalibus bonis locupletaretur, omnia sua vendidit et viam deliberationis dominici Sepulcri arripuit.¹

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 23v-24r (Recueil, V, p. 548); Sanudo, p. 135; Recueil, III, pp. 739-40.

It may be seen from this comparison that Accolti probably used as his source Sanudo's account rather than Robert's; for Sanudo includes almost exactly the same details as Accolti does, whereas Robert includes much that is not found in Accolti. If Accolti had actually used Sanudo's version in conjunction with Robert's, one would expect to find some detail from Robert's account in Accolti's version. As it is, no trace of Robert's more detailed version can be found in Accolti's account. Similar is the passage narrating the flight of Kilij Arslan (Solimanus) after the capture of Nicea, also based on Sanudo; again no details from Robert of St Remy's account can be detected.¹ Another example is the point in De bello at which Accolti introduces for the first time the princes who were to lead the expedition. He takes this passage almost word for word from Sanudo, adding no new names of which he might have learned from William of Tyre:

<u>Accolti</u>	<u>Sanudo</u>	<u>William</u>
Quorum nobiliores hi fuerunt: Ugo, cognomine Magnus, Philippis Gallie regis frater, Ro- bertus Normandie provincie dominus, Guilielmus ex Bri- tania insula maxime clarus ac domi po- tens, Stephanus Carnutensium et Blesensium Gal- lorum princeps, Tholose comes Ray- mundus, Guarnerius Gressis princeps, Baldoinus Fenealti dominus, Bimontes Aurengie imperans, Stephanus Albe Mar- chie regulus, Ugo urbis Divi Pauli dominus, Flandriam regens, Goffredus Lotteringie prin- ceps, Eustachii filius, qui Bononie,	Inter quos fuerunt praecipui et not- issimi viri Hugo magnus, frater Phi- lippi Regis Fran- ciae: Robertus Comes Flandriae: Robertus Dux Nor- mandiae: Guiliel- mus de Anglia: Stephanus Comes Carnotensis et Blesensis, qui fuit pater Comi- tis Theobaldi an- tiqui: Raymun- dus Comes Tholo- sae: Comes Gar- nerius de Gres: Balduinus Comes de Henauth: Bi- mont Comes de Au- rengia: Guiliel- mus Comes de Fo- res: Stephaus, Comes D'Aubemare: Retreu Comes Deu- perche: Hugo,	Desl resgne de- France et d'Al- emengne se croisa Hues li mein nez frere le roi Felipe de France, Roberz li quens de Flandre, Roberz li dus de Normendie, fuilz le roi Guillaumes d'Angleterre, Es- tiennes li quens de Chartres et de Blois qui fu peres le conte Tiebaut le viell qui gist à Largny, Resmons li quens de Tholouse, et maint chevalier de sa terre, et li vaillanz honz God- efrois de Boillon dux de Loorregne, et avoit si deus frere Baudoins et Huistances, et un lor còusin Baudoin de Borc qui estoit

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod 54,6, fol. 42r (Recueil, V, p. 563); Recueil, III, pp. 764-6; Sanudo, pp. 139-40.

que in Gallia est, imperium tenuit,... Venere cum eo Bal- duinus et Eusta- chius, fratres...	Comes Sancti pauli:...Goti- fredus, Heusta- chii Bononiensis Comitis filius... Cume illo quoque duo fratres eius, Balduinus et Eus- tachius	fix le conte Huon de Retel, li cuens Garins de Grex, Baudoins li quens de Henaut, Ysoirs li quens de Die, Raimbaus li cuens d'Oreng, Guillaumes li quens de Forez, Estiennes li quens d'Aubemarle, Ro- troz li quens del Perche, Hues li quens de seint Pol... Raoul de Baujenci, Esvart de Puisat, Gui de Garlande seneschal le roi de France, Thomas de Fere, etc. ¹
--	---	--

Accolti's failure to collate his sources sometimes led to glaring blunders. For example, he stated on his own authority that the siege of Nicea lasted thirty days;² if however he had consulted Robert of St Remy's history he would have learnt that the siege had lasted fifty-two days.³ Similarly, Accolti himself added to Sanudo's account of the Council of Clermont that Adhemar of Monteil had willingly become Papal Legate in charge of the crusade: 'Is libenter suscepto negotio'.⁴ Robert of St Remy, however, had explicitly stated that Adhemar had been unwilling to become Papal Legate: 'Universi vero elegerunt Podiensem episcopum. . . . Ille itaque, licet invitatus, suscepit. . .'.⁵ The evidence suggests that Accolti did not collate his sources with a view to checking their accuracy, and that this failing led him on occasion to make howlers.

How Accolti seems to have collated his sources may be seen from two further examples. At one point during the

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11v-12r (Recueil, V, p. 539); Sanudo, pp. 131-2; Recueil, I, pp. 45-6.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 40v; Recueil, V, p. 562.

3. Cf. Recueil, III, p. 758.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11v (Recueil, V, p. 539) with Sanudo, p. 131.

5. Recueil, III, p. 731.

siege of Antioch, Accolti tells how the besieged lost some horses to the crusaders; for the beginning of the episode he follows William of Tyre:

Accolti

premente urbem inopia, pre-
sertim pabuli pro ipsis e-
quis, miserat Asias equos
multos, qui extra urbem pas-
cerentur, et erat locus
in quo stabant tribus mili-
bus passuum ab ea distans;
ibi appositi sunt custodes,
ne fuerent equi, neve ab
hoste caperentur. Id ex-
ploratum nostri habentes
validam manum eo miserunt,
ut equos omnes inde abduc-
erent, qui, profecti occulto
itinere, cesis custodibus,
tria vilia validorum equorum
deduxere. . .

William

avoit un moult biaux pleins
de mout beles pastures et trop
planteis d'erbes à trois milles
ou à quatre de la cité. Cil-
de la vile, porcequ'il n'av-
oient mie assez pastures dedenz
les murs, avoient là envoié
grant partie de leur chevau-
cheures. Quant cil de l'ost
l'aperçurent, il assemblerent
assez chevaliers et sergenz,
puis alerent cele part, non
mie par droite voie, mez par
destroiz et par voies covertes,
tant qu'il saillirent à ceus
qui les gardoient et les oc-
cistrent. Deux mile chevaux
en amenerent en l'ost. . .¹

At the very end, however, he tacks on a passage from Robert of St Remy to show how the besieged reacted to their loss:

Accolti

tria milia validorum equo-
rum deduxere; que res ve-
hementer fregit hostium
animos, et, nisi in ope
sui regis, spem reliquam
nullam habebant.

Robert

Quod infortunium cives vehe-
menter attrivit, quoniam ab-
undantia rerum, quae nostros
roboravit, perdita illos de-
bilitavit.²

Similarly, when describing the march of the crusaders from Antioch to Jerusalem, Accolti follows William's version up to their arrival at Caesarea:

Accolti

ad urbem Tyrum pervenere,
. . .prope quam positis
castris, nostri, amenitate
regionis pollecti rerum
omnium abundantis, triduo
iter intermiserunt. Deinde

William

Tant alerent que il vindrent
à cele noble cité de Sur; là
se logierent devant la très
noble fontaine des courtiz,
ès puis des eues, si com dit
l'escripture. Es jardins mout

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 60r-60v (Recueil, V, p. 578); Recueil, I, p. 207.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 60r-60v (Recueil, V, p. 578); Recueil, III, p. 793.

moventes, inter mare ac montes via difficili atque angusta, Ptolomaidam petunt, Acrem post ab incolis dictam. Ibi ad levam flexo itinere relictique a dexteris Galilea, inter mare ac montem Carmelum ibant, quoad Cesaream fuit ventum.

delitables furent une nuit. Quant il fu ajorné, il se mistrent à la voie et passerent un destroit mout perilleus qui est entre les montengnes et la mer; il descendirent es plains de la cité d'Acre, iluec seur une eue corant tendirent leur paveillons... D'ilec s'en alerent avant li pelerin; à senestre lessierent Gualilée, entre le mont de Qarmel et la mer, et vindrent à Cesaire...¹

Then again to the end he appends an historical and geographical description of Caesarea, whose source is Robert of St. Remy:

Accolti

Cæsaream fuit ventum. Id Iudee provincie oppidum ab ipso initio Stratonis Pyrgus dicebatur; sed, cum Herodes pene collapsum amplificasset, ei Cesaree nomen indidit, Octavium Cesarem honore proseguens...

Robert

Est autem Caesarea insignis civitas Palestinae, ... Est autem in littore maris sita, olim Pyrgos, id est Turris Stratonis, appellata. Sed ab Herode rege nobilius et pulchrius, contra vim maris utilius exstructa, in honorem Caesaris Augusti Caesarea est cognominata...²

These examples suggest that Accolti used his sources to supplement, not to check, one another. He seems to have followed one source, until he decided to change to another. In this way, he follows William of Tyre exclusively from the beginning of Peter the Hermit's pilgrimage until the Council of Clermont;³ then he turns to Sanudo and follows only his account to the spring preceding the departure of the first crusaders;⁴ and finally he turns back to William to narrate the account of Walter the Penniless' expedition.⁵

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 85r-85v (Recueil, V, p. 598); Recueil, I, p. 312.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 85r-85v (Recueil, V, pp. 598-9); Recueil, III, p. 858.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 5r-7v (Recueil, V, pp. 534-5) with Recueil, I, pp. 32-9.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7v-12v (Recueil, V, pp. 535-40) with Sanudo, pp. 131-2.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 12v seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 540 seq.) with Recueil, I, pp. 47 seq.

Similarly, he follows only William's account from the departure of the crusaders from Nicea up to the point at which Baldwin of Bouillon leaves the main army to seek his fortune in Armenia;¹ he then changes to Sanudo to narrate Baldwin's adventures in Armenia and uses him exclusively up to the capture by the crusaders of Artošia;² and then he returns to William to narrate the capture of the bridge over the river Orontes.³

Biondo's methods of collating his sources in the Decades were similar to Accolti's. As an illustration of Biondo's procedure, his account of Godfrey's march from the West to Constantinople may be taken. Biondo's main source, Robert of St Remy, does not give any of the details of Godfrey's expedition: in the first book of his Historia Robert introduces Godfrey when treating of Peter the Hermit's expedition.⁴ He makes the error of saying that Peter was associated with Godfrey, but never clarifies exactly what he meant by 'associatur'. Robert's treatment of Godfrey at this point evidently gave Biondo the mistaken impression that Godfrey and Peter the Hermit travelled together to Constantinople.⁵ Biondo's initial confusion became greater, as he attempted to narrate the events of Peter's stay near Constantinople. For he had to explain how it was only Peter's army, and not Godfrey's, that crossed over the Hellespont and was massacred by Kilij Arslan. In the end he came up with the solution that Godfrey had ordered all the troops, his own and Peter's, not to cross the Hellespont; when however Peter's troops began to plunder the region around Constantinople and generally were conducting themselves in a disorderly manner, Godfrey, according to Biondo, ordered them to

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 40v-46r (Recueil, V, pp. 562-7) with Recueil, I, pp. 129-148.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 46r-49r (Recueil, V, pp. 566-9) with Sanudo, pp. 141-2.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 49r seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 569 seq.) with Recueil, I, pp. 164 seq.

4. Recueil, III, p. 731.

5. Decades, p. 209.

cross the Hellespont; his own troops, however, as they were evidently more orderly, remained behind in Europe.¹ This of course is a glaring blunder. For in fact Godfrey did not march to the East with Peter and only arrived at Constantinople after Peter had been defeated by Kiliç Arslan. This is made perfectly clear by William of Tyre,² who, if he had been consulted, would have saved Biondo from making such a howler. In apology for Biondo, it must be remembered that Robert's account was ambiguous; however, if Biondo had been in the habit of checking his sources, he would never have been guilty of such an error. It seems not to have occurred to him, when encountering a confused passage in one source, to clear up the ambiguity by reference to another source.

How Biondo seems to have collated his sources may be suggested by another example. In narrating the march of the crusaders from Nicea to Antioch, Biondo followed Robert of St Remy's Historia exclusively up to Baldwin's departure for Armenia.³ Robert, however, did not mention Baldwin's Armenian expedition, so that Biondo was obliged to turn to William of Tyre as the source for the summary of it found in the Decades.⁴ Then he turned back to Robert to narrate the rest of the march to Antioch.⁵ But Robert's narrative, at the point where the crusaders reached Antioch, only included a brief description of the city.⁶ To find a more complete description, Biondo turned back to William of Tyre,⁷ but afterwards returned to Robert to narrate the beginning

1. Ibid.

2. Cf. Recueil, I, pp. 50 seq. and 71 seq.

3. Cf. Decades, pp. 212-3 with Recueil, III, pp. 766-9.

4. Cf. Decades, p. 213 with Recueil, I, pp. 153 seq.

5. Cf. Decades, pp. 213-4 with Recueil, III, pp. 766-9.

6. Cf. Recueil, III, pp. 771-2 and Buchholz, Die Quellen, p. 81.

7. Cf. Decades, p. 214 with Rerum italicarum scriptores, VII, col. 688-9. In this instance Biondo used Pipino's translation of William: cf. Buchholz, Die Quellen, p. 81.

of the siege.¹ Biondo's methods of collating his sources, therefore, seem to have been similar to Accolti's: rather than use one source to check the veracity of another, he used his sources to supplement one another. In Biondo's case, there is an exception which, it might be argued, proves the rule. With regard to the numbers killed during the capture of Antioch by the crusaders, Biondo gives the impression that he checked Robert's version by reference to William's:

'Stragis in barbaros factae numerum, Robertus monachus, qui tunc Hierosolymis erat, non ponit: quam Gulielmus, et caeteri ferme omnes, suo in similibus more centum fuisse dicunt millium armatorum.'² But Biondo could not actually have consulted William's account in order to check the numbers of dead given by Robert, because Robert did not in fact quote any such number. Evidently Biondo was interested to know how many died during the capture of Antioch and therefore found Robert's account insufficient; to supplement his account he turned to William of Tyre. But William disappointed him too; for he was unable to accept his exaggerated figure of 100,000.³ Indeed, Biondo did not hide his irritation at William's inadequacies: 'suo in similibus more.'

Accolti therefore was not the only humanist historian to make use of this kind of historical method. Indeed, Accolti's and Biondo's procedure seems more to be that of a storyteller than what would now be called an historian's. They were more interested in filling in the details of the story than in taking precautions that the story told was what actually happened. They used their sources in much the same way as an historical novelist might do, changing from chronicle to chronicle according to their conception of what the narrative required. It might be asked what the narrative requirements were which prompted Accolti and Biondo to abandon one source in favour of another. In general, the evidence suggests that they were led to look beyond their

1. Cf. Decades, pp. 214-5 with Recueil, III, pp. 775 seq.

2. Decades, p. 227.

3. Biondo here again used Pipino's translation of William: cf. Buchholz, Die Quellen, pp. 80-1.

main source in the hope of giving their work the appearance of a classical history.

It has been pointed out above that, according to ancient historiographical theory, historical style should be smooth and flowing, and that this was a notion that was taken up by the humanists in their own treatises on historiography.¹ On one occasion in De bello, Accolti, in accordance with this precept, changed from one source to another in order to achieve a less abrupt transition. Accolti followed William of Tyre's account to narrate the unsuccessful attempt of a number of Germans and France to organize a crusading expedition.² Of the survivors of this expedition, William of Tyre had stated only that 's'en revint en son pais /Germany_7 à tout grant partie de sa gent descomfite. Li autre baron de France, que ge vos ai nomez, s'en vindrent en Lombardie et passerent en Puille. La sorent que aucuns des granz barons estoient passez à Duraz et d'iluecques alez en Grece: si alerent après et les suivirent.'³ William says nothing further about the expedition in Apulia, but turns his account to the departure of Godfrey's force from Germany.⁴ Sanudo, on the otherhand, after paraphrasing William's account of how the survivors of the German and French expedition joined the other force embarking from Apulia, followed the course of that expedition from Apulia until it reached Constantinople.⁵ Sanudo used the survivors of the German and French expedition as a link between two episodes, thereby achieving a smoother narrative than William had done. Accolti evidently saw the advantages of Sanudo's account, and therefore put aside William's version after the survivors reached Apulia, to follow Sanudo's narrative of the Apulian expedition up to Constantinople.

1. Cf. pp. 176-7 and 179 above.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 22v-23v (Recueil, V, pp. 547-8) with Recueil, I, pp. 66-9.

3. Recueil, I, pp. 68-9.

4. Ibid. p. 71.

5. Cf. Sanudo, p. 135.

Indeed, in Accolti's version the transition achieved by the survivors of the German and French expedition is made even more explicit than it had been in Sanudo's account:

Accolti

Hoc accepto incommodo, et spe amissa iter inceptum prosequendi, Germani domum, Italiam Galli petiere. Qui, certiores facti multos ex Gallia in Apuliam transgredi, quo inde cum classe in Greciam tenderent, eo profecti socia illis iunxerunt arma. Quorum omnium duces erant legatus pontificis. . .

Sanudo

Comes Emico ad propria rediit: Barones Gallici in Apuliam transeunt, ibique aliis transfretantibus sociati sunt. Hugo Magnus frater Regis Franciae, comitesque Normandiae. . .

In fact, transitions such as this one were a common device employed by Livy, as for example when he links a council at Sicyon with the siege of Corinth by following the journey of troops despatched by the council to Corinth.²

Speeches in direct discourse were a characteristic feature of ancient historiography, and Accolti sometimes changed his source in order to find more details of what had been said in a speech. An example is Urban II's oration at Clermont. The French translation of William of Tyre (in contrast to the Latin original) only included a very brief summary of Urban's speech.³ Sanudo included a more complete version of Urban's speech, and Accolti turned to his account, rather than to William's for some of the topics of the oration.⁴ Sometimes Accolti's main source did not mention a speech that was cited in another source; in that case Accolti changed sources in order to include the speech. An example is the Bishop of Le Puy's oration after the discovery of the True Cross.⁵ Accolti found a reference to

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 23v-24r (Recueil, V, p. 548) with Sanudo, p. 135.

2. Walsh, Livy, p. 181. Cf. ibid. pp. 180-1 for further examples of this technique.

3. Cf. Recueil, I, pp. 39-42.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 8v (Recueil, V, pp. 536-7) with Sanudo, p. 131.

5. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 67r seq.; Recueil, V, pp. 584 seq.

such a speech not in William but in Robert of St Remy.¹ Interestingly enough, this speech was not reported by Sanudo;² Accolti evidently was so keen to include a speech on this occasion, that he even looked beyond Sanudo, on whom he usually relied, to supplement William. Another example is Bohemond's speech to his followers at the end of the first book of De bello,³ which had its source not in William, but in Sanudo.⁴

Digressions were a common device used by ancient historians to relieve the tedium of a continuous narrative,⁵ and occasionally Accolti changed the source he was following to be able to include such digressions. He followed William of Tyre's account of the journey of the crusaders up to Caesarea in Judaea.⁶ Then he turned to Robert of St Remy's Historia in order to include a few details of the history of Caesarea during antiquity.⁷ Again it is significant that Accolti went beyond Sanudo to Robert for material in this digression. Another type of digression common in classical historiography concerned national character or national history.⁸ Accolti turned the first few sentences of William of Tyre into a long description of the origins of Islam, Mohamet's early life, and the customs and laws of the Muslims, by reference to Sanudo, who included details about Mohamet and the Muslims not found in William.⁹ Indeed,

1. Cf. Recueil, III, pp. 829 seq.

2. Sanudo, p. 145.

3. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 25r seq.; Recueil, V, pp. 549 seq.

4. Sanudo, p. 135.

5. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 156-7, for examples of geographical digressions in Livy.

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 85r-85v (Recueil, V, p. 598) with Recueil, I, pp. 310-2.

7. Cf. p. 197 above.

8. Cf. for example Livy on the Gauls, V, xxxiii-v.

9. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 3r-3v (Recueil, V, pp. 532-3) with Sanudo, pp. 124, 127.

Accolti's account of the character and historical background of the Muslims, placed as it is at the beginning of De bello, is strongly reminiscent of Sallust's digression on the African character at the beginning of the Bellum Iugurthinum.¹

Another feature of ancient historiography were accounts of the careers of characters of important participants in the narrative. Cicero had made such descriptions a requirement of history,² and both Livy's and Sallust's works have many such character portraits and accounts of careers.³ In accordance with this precept of classical historiography, Accolti on one occasion changed sources in order to be able to include further details of the career of an important personage of the First Crusade, Kilij Arslan, the Seldjuk Sultan of Nicea. After the capture of Nicea, Kilij Arslan made a last-ditch attempt to defeat the crusading army on their march from Nicea to Antioch. In narrating this engagement, Accolti followed William of Tyre's account.⁴ William, however, does not relate any further details of the Sultan's career. On the other hand, Sanudo follows the battle with an account of how the Sultan, having encountered in flight some reinforcements who had been sent to him, discouraged them from venturing to fight the crusaders.⁵ Accolti considered these details of Kilij Arslan's later adventures worthy of De bello; so after his account of the battle, he changed his source from William to Sanudo in order to include them.⁶

Probably the most pressing narrative requirement which influenced Accolti's choice of sources in De bello was the

1. BJ, 17-19.

2. De oratore, II, 63.

3. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 82-109; Sallust, BC, 5, 14-16, 54; BJ, 6-7, 95-6.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 41r-41v (Recueil, V, pp. 562-3) with Recueil, I, pp. 129-134.

5. Sanudo, pp. 139-40.

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 42r; Recueil, V, p. 563.

desire to make of his history a series of exempla of virtue. Sallust and Livy declared that history was useful because it inspired virtue by providing concrete examples of worthy action;¹ presumably it was because of its moral value that Cicero called history the 'magistra vitae'. Lapo da Castiglionchio spent much of his treatise on historiography making the same point,² and in the Preface to De bello Accolti himself said that he hoped to inspire his contemporaries to virtue by bringing to light the great deeds of the early crusaders.³ On several occasions Accolti changed the source he was following in De bello in order to emphasize the virtues of the first crusaders. One example is the passage in which he gives an account of the oaths they swore to Alexius I that they would restore to him any conquered lands formerly belonging to the Empire.⁴ To include this account Accolti went beyond both William of Tyre and Sanudo to Robert of St Remy,⁵ evidently in the hope of exhibiting the noble altruism of the crusaders, who had not come to the East to conquer, but to free the enslaved church. Indeed, Accolti explicitly points to the crusaders' virtue in swearing fealty to Alexius: 'Neque enim dominandi libidine ceperant arma, sed quo Sacrum Sepulchrum Iudeamque liberarent.'⁶ Another example of Accolti's procedure may be seen in his account of the capture of Nicea. William of Tyre had given the correct version of how the city was taken: the inhabitants, reduced to desperation, surrendered the city to the Emperor unbeknownst to the crusaders.⁷ Sanudo, on the other hand, included a much simplified account, in which the citizens surrendered to the crusaders, who in turn handed the city over to the

1. BJ, IV, 5-6; Livy, Praef. 10.

2. Cf. Cod. Ott. Lat., 1677, fol. 211r-214r.

3. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 2 r; Recueil, V, p. 530.

4. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31v; Recueil, V, p. 555.

5. Cf. Recueil, III, pp. 748-50.

6. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31v (Recueil, V, p. 555).

7. Recueil, I, pp. 127-8.

Emperor.¹ Accolti followed Sanudo's version,² presumably because the long condemnations of Greek treachery in William's account had nothing to do with his theme of the crusaders' virtues, and might only have detracted from the value of his history as a series of moral exempla. Another example is the surrender of Edessa by its citizens to Baldwin of Bouillon. William of Tyre had said that the Greek Lord of Edessa at first welcomed Baldwin, but then became involved in complicated plots on his life; eventually the citizens rose against their lord and put him to death, electing Baldwin in his place.³ Sanudo, in a much simplified account, said that the Greek lord had been killed before Baldwin came to Edessa, and on his arrival he took the former lord's place.⁴ Accolti chose Sanudo's less complicated version,⁵ evidently because it eliminated details which would have been of no use for praising Baldwin's virtues.

In his account of the First Crusade in the Decades, Biondo seems to have changed the source he was following for much the same purposes as Accolti did in De bello. In the passages from the Decades in which it was pointed out above how Biondo turned from source to source, most of the changes seem to have been made with the intention of adding classical elements to the narrative.⁶ Baldwin's Armenian expedition, for example, revealed his virtue and prowess as a soldier and Biondo, evidently feeling he could not pass over those events, was led to interrupt his narrative based on Robert of St Remy and include a mention of Baldwin's adventures and include a mention of Baldwin's adventures based on William of Tyre. Similarly, Biondo included a description of Antioch taken from William, not from Robert, since he evidently knew that classical siege

1. Cf. Sanudo, p. 139.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 40r-40v; Recueil, V, p. 562.

3. Recueil, I, pp. 154-9.

4. Cf. Sanudo, p. 141.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 46v-47r; Recueil, V, 567.

6. Cf. pp. 199-200 above.

accounts were usually preceded by such descriptions.¹

Admittedly it has been shown that Biondo made some attempt to make truth the basis of history by choosing eye-witness and contemporary accounts as the main sources of his history. On that score he lived up more closely to the ideals of ancient historiography than Accolti, who was more careless in his choice of sources. But even Biondo did not go much further in the pursuit of truth than choosing as a main source a contemporary or eye-witness chronicle. It has been shown that Biondo, like Accolti, did not check the accuracy of his main source by reference to other accounts; rather both he and Accolti looked further afield simply to supplement the account given by their main source. The evidence suggests that they usually supplemented the sources not in the interest of truth, but of literary effect, in the hope of giving their works a classical appearance. Accolti or Biondo should not be expected to have relied extensively on their supplementary sources, since they consulted them to add literary touches to the account, not to bring new material to light. This may be illustrated finally by comparing Biondo's and Accolti's versions of events in the First Crusade. They were ultimately based on the same two sources, Robert of St Remy and William of Tyre; nevertheless, their accounts differ considerably at various points because William was Accolti's main source, whereas Robert was Biondo's. An example is the origin of the crusade: Biondo, following Robert, attributes the idea of a crusade to Urban II,² whereas Accolti, following William, says that Peter the Hermit was responsible.³ Neither Accolti nor Biondo mention that there was a version of the events other than what they presented. Such an important point of divergence shows how little use they made of their supplementary sources when literary requirements were not pressing.

1. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 153 seq., 197 seq.; De oratore, II, 63; Sallust, BJ, XXXVII 4, LVII 1, LXXVI 2, LXXXIX 4-7, XCII 5-8.

2. Cf. Decades, p. 207 with Recueil, III, pp. 727 seq.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 5r seq. (Recueil, V, p. 534 seq.) with Recueil, I, pp. 32 seq.

* * * * *

In ancient historiographical theory truth not only consisted of a simple narration of facts derived from eye-witness or contemporary accounts. According to Sempronius Asellio, as quoted by Aulus Gellius, it was not enough for an historian to state the facts, 'quod factum esset'; he should probe the motives behind them: an historian distinguished himself from a chronicler by telling the whole truth.¹ The historian's task, in other words, was not only to report the bare facts, but to reconstruct from them what must have been the underlying causes of events. The idea that the historian should look beneath the surface and present a full account of causes, motivation and character was further developed by Cicero in De oratore:

The nature of the subject needs chronological arrangement and geographical representation: and since, in reading of important affairs worth recording, the plans of campaign, the executive actions and the results are successively looked for, it calls also, as regard such plans, for some intimation of what the writer approves, and, in the narrative of achievement, not only for a statement of what was done or said, but also of the manner of doing or saying it; and, in the estimate of consequences, for an exposition of all contributory causes, whether originating in accident, discretion or foolhardiness; and, as for the individual actors, besides an account of their exploits, it demands particulars of the lives and characters of such as are outstanding in renown and dignity.²

In the interest of reaching a wider truth, it was the historian's duty to go beyond the bare facts of his sources into the realm of deduction; it was his job to ascertain what must have happened as well as what happened. A worthy history, in the eyes of ancient theorists, must be distinguished not only by accuracy but also by plausibility: it must have the quality of verisimilitude. Verisimilitude was considered one of the essential attributes of narration: 'tres res convenit habere narrationem: ut brevis, ut di-

1. V, xviii, 8-9.

2. II, 63 (tr. E.W. Sutton, Loeb Classical Library, London, 1942₇, vol. I, p. 245).

lucida, ut veri similis sit.'¹ It was for this reason that Quintilian praised Livy's speeches for their fidelity to the character of the speaker and their regard for the circumstances in which he was speaking: 'quae dicuntur omnia cum rebus tum personis accomodata sunt.'²

Following the lead of the ancients, humanist historiographical theory stressed the importance of creating verisimilitude in history. In his treatise on historiography mentioned earlier, Lapo da Castiglionchio interrupts his paraphrase of De oratore to include a passage of his own composition, in which he praises the historian who includes many occasions for speeches in his work. He points out that in writing speeches the worthy historian is faithful to the actual character of the speaker (servata personarum dignitate) thereby lending verisimilitude to his work (ipsam probabilem hystoriam reddunt /sc. conciones 7).³ It is significant that Lapo saw fit to break up his exposition of De oratore to mention the point that speeches should be adapted to personalities and circumstances; for he thus showed that the ancient concern for verisimilitude in history had become part of the humanists' own outlook.

The humanists' concern for verisimilitude in history can be seen in their treatment of speeches. The conventions of the classical tradition allowed historians to compose their own speeches; nevertheless, in order to give them an aura of authenticity, they sometimes included elements that were not fictitious. For example, in De bello Accolti often found the occasion for a speech in his sources. Thus Urban II's oration at Clermont was mentioned by Sanudo and William of Tyre;⁴ Bohemond's speech to his followers, by Sanudo;⁵

1. Rhet. ad Her., I, ix, 14; cf. also Quintilian, II, 5, 7 and Walsh, Livy, pp. 31-2.

2. X, 1, 101.

3. Cf. note 5, pp. 180-1, above.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 7v (Recueil, V, p. 536) with Recueil, I, pp. 39-42.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6 fol. 25r (Recueil, V, p. 549) Sanudo, p. 135.

Godfrey's exhortation to the army before the battle with Yaghi-Siyan (Asias), by William;¹ and the Bishop of Le Puy's speech before the battle with Kerbogha, by Robert of St Remy.² Occasionally topics of speeches were taken from his sources. Thus Urban II's account of the abuses against Christians committed by the Moslems, the pollution of Christian churches, the violent circumcisions of Christians, their blood left dripping from the altars, is based on Sanudo's account of Urban's speech.³ Similarly, in one of the few speeches found in the first two of Biondo's Decades,⁴ Urban II's address to the crusaders at Clermont, both the occasion and some of the topics were found in his source, Robert of St Remy.⁵

Nevertheless, Biondo and Accolti could not go all the way in attempting to give their speeches the semblance of actuality. Both were endeavouring to write speeches in the classical manner, and if they adhered too closely to speeches found in their medieval sources or paid too much attention to portraying what a speaker at the time of the crusades most probably would have said, their speeches would bear little resemblance to those found in Livy or Sallust. For example, although both Accolti's and Biondo's version of Urban II's speech at Clermont contained a few elements that were not fictitious, nevertheless both speeches were composed according to the conventions of classical rhetoric, just as were the speeches in the Ab urbe condita; they are much more the sentiments that Livy's Scipio Africanus or Hannibal would have expressed on the occasion than Pope Urban II. Both Accolti and Biondo begin with an introduction referring to

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 58r (Recueil, V, p. 576) with Recueil, I, p. 200.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 67r (Recueil, V, p. 584) with Recueil, III, p. 829.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 8v (Recueil, V, pp. 536-7) with Sanudo, p. 131.

4. Cf. D. Hay, 'Flavio Biondo and the Middle Ages,' Proceedings of the British Academy, XLV (1959), p. 114.

5. Cf. Decades, p. 207 with Recueil, III, p. 727.

the topic of the speech (principium a re): the disastrous state of the East. Then Biondo outlines the arguments he will use (divisio): the example of his audience's ancestors, the hope of reward, and the dangers which the infidel pose to Europe. Each of these is a topos of deliberative oratory, urging the course of action advocated by the speaker on the grounds of expediency (utile) or honour (honestum) and each constitutes a part of the main body (tractatio) of Biondo's speech. After the introduction, Accolti's speech proceeds along somewhat different lines from Biondo's, although still in conformity with the rules of classical rhetoric. He omits a formal divisio and immediately enters into the tractatio. He points out that a crusade will be a righteous (honestum) as well as a profitable (utile) war, because it will not only provide a new empire for the crusaders but will also restore Christianity in the East. He concludes with a long section on the ease with which the crusaders will achieve victory (facile).¹

The humanists' attempt to lend verisimilitude to their histories was not restricted to speeches but extended to many other aspects of their works. Just as in the speeches, however, their efforts to lend the semblance of reality to their reconstruction of the past was bound up with their endeavour to imitate ancient models. The humanists were writing in the classical manner. The point of view from which they attempted to go beyond a simple narrative of facts, to probe the deeper questions of history, was that of an ancient historian. Inevitably, their attempt to reconstruct the past was influenced and even distorted by their efforts to imitate classical models.

Accolti was able frequently to reconcile the requirements of classical imitation and verisimilitude. He achieved considerable success, for example, in depicting situations of human interest, which had been an important element of Livy's narrative as for example in his famous account of the rape of Lucretia by Sextus Tarquinius.² One instance

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7v-11r (Recueil, V, pp. 536-8) and Decades, pp. 207-8.

2. I, lviii; cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 191 seq., 212-218.

is the occasion on which some stragglers from Peter the Hermit's army were attacked by Bulgarians from Nish. When the main army learnt of the incident, Accolti went beyond his source and reconstructed their reaction convincingly, emphasizing the depth of their anguish with narrative infinitives:

Hac re tam tristi ad Petrum delata, idem celeriter misit nuntios, qui ante pregressos revocarent; qui redeuntes et simul cum reliquis ad stragem videndam suorum profecti, cum tot occisos reperissent, quisque ipsorum vehementer flere, rem prorsus nefariam esse dicere, tantam perfidiam execrari, ulciscendum id scelus palam fremere, supplices manus ad celum tendere, Deum, vindicem invocans, cuius militiam assumpsisset.

Another example is his account of the siege of Nicea, in which he added details of the part that women and children must have played in defending the city from the crusaders:

Igitur cum supplicia, mors feda, ruina urbis essent ob oculos, non militaris modo etas aut virilis, sed femine puerique supra corporis atque animi vires aderant, propugnantibus tela ac saxa ministrantes. . . Matres familie, dum tela vel saxa illis porrigunt, passis crinibus, flentes orabant, ut, sua virtute, coniuges, liberos crudelitati hostium eriperent.²

Ancient historians frequently mentioned or cited letters in their works³ and at times Accolti went beyond his

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 15v (Recueil, V, p. 542); cf. Recueil, I, pp. 53-4.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 38v-39v (Recueil, V, pp. 560-1); cf. Recueil, I, pp. 117-23. Other examples of additions for the sake of human interest: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 4v (Recueil, V, p. 533) -- Christians forced to emigrate from Holy Land after conquest of Jerusalem; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13r (Recueil, V, p. 540) -- stragglers, robbed of their belongings, return almost naked to the main army; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16r (Recueil, V, p. 542) -- ties of blood lead crusaders to avenge injuries committed by Hungarians; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16v-17r (Recueil, V, p. 543) -- emphasis on fear and trepidation suffered by retreating army; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 18r (Recueil, V, p. 544) -- plight of Christians after battle of Manzikert; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 21r (Recueil, V, p. 546) -- plight of crusaders defeated by Kilij Arslan; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 89v (Recueil, V, p. 603) -- entrance to temple in Jerusalem had to be sought barefoot from the Egyptians.

3. Walsh, Livy, p. 84: Cf. also Sallust, BC, XXXV, XLIV 5 and BJ, IX 2, XXIV, LXX 5.

sources to find occasions on which it is reasonable to assume that letters were sent. One example is the exchange of letters between Urban II and Alexius I at the beginning of the crusade, which is mentioned by Accolti but not by his source.¹ Accolti said too that letters were sent from the leaders of the expedition to Raymond of Toulouse to urge him to hurry to Nicea, whereas his source, William of Tyre, had not specified that letters were the means by which the message to Raymond was sent.² Another example are the letters sent by the King of Egypt to his subjects in Jerusalem urging them to resist the crusaders, which only Accolti mentions.³

Congresses and councils played a large part in classical historiography⁴ and Accolti was often able to point out occasions on which it was probable that conferences were held. It is reasonable to suppose, as does Accolti, that the question of the surrender of Gottschalk's army to the King of Hungary was referred to a council of crusaders, although no such council was mentioned by William of Tyre.⁵ Again it is possible that Alexius discussed Godfrey's visit to Constantinople with his council, by whose advice he decided to send his son as a hostage to the crusaders.⁶ Perhaps Accolti is going too far in his speculation when he says that the leaders of the plot against Baldwin in Edessa were invited to council where they were arrested, although there is no reason to assume that such means were not used to apprehend the conspirators.⁷ Accolti sometimes made

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 12v (Recueil, V, p. 539) with Sanudo, p. 132.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 36v-37r (Recueil, V, p. 559) with Recueil, I, p. 115.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 92v (Recueil, V, p. 604) with Recueil, I, p. 335.

4. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 204-8.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 22v (Recueil, V, p. 547) with Recueil, I, p. 65.

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31r (Recueil, V, p. 554) with Recueil, I, p. 87.

7. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 76v (Recueil, V, p. 591) with Recueil, I, pp. 284-5. Another example: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 33r (Recueil, V, p. 556).

reasonable deductions about the nature of councils which were mentioned in his sources. Thus he broadened the scope of the council held on the day after Urban II's speech at Clermont from a 'conventus episcoporum',¹ to a war council at which princes or their legates were present;² at that council Accolti may also have been correct in supposing that instructions were given to preach the crusade. Accolti also reconstructed the conference between Alexius' legates and Godfrey near Constantinople. William said only that Alexius sent his legates several times to ask Godfrey to come to Constantinople; he did not explicitly state that the legates were answered directly at the crusaders' camp. Accolti, on the other hand, assumes that a full-fledged conference took place, with the legates presenting their request and Godfrey answering them there and then.³

Occasionally the lessons of ancient historiographical theory may have helped Accolti to improve upon his sources. The Western chronicles written at the time of the crusades were extremely prejudiced against Byzantium; in Accolti's day Byzantium had ceased to pose a threat to Western interests in the East, so that the grounds for anti-Greek feeling in the West were removed. Accolti was now in a position to heed Cicero's, Livy's and Sallust's admonitions against malice and partiality in history and therefore went to considerable lengths to expurgate and alter passages in his sources which showed prejudice against the Greeks. For example, William had included a highly unfavourable account of Alexius Comnenus' rise to power:

En ce tens estoit empereres en Costantinoble uns
Grieux mout faux et moult trichierres et mout
desloiax, Alexès avoit non, en seurnon Conins.
Cil fu mout bien et mout privez à l'autre empereor
qui ot non Nichefores Botoniat, si que il en fist

1. Cf. Sanudo, p. 131.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11r (Recueil, V, p. 538).

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 30r (Recueil, V, p. 554) with Recueil, I, p. 83. Other examples: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13v-14r (Recueil, V, p. 540); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 28v-29r (Recueil, V, pp. 552-3); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fol. 31v (Recueil, V, p. 555).

son senechal, et estoit li greindres hom de la terre fors l'empereor. Il, par sa malice, porchaça mal vers son seingnor, si que par l'asent des granz genz qui se tindrent devers lui, le prist et le tenoit en sa chartre sis ans avoit quant nostre pelerin vindrent là.¹

Accolti, in rewriting this passage, omitted all reference to Alexius' treachery and malice, and simply narrated the bare facts: 'Tertiusque ab eo Diogene regnabat princeps, qui Nichophorum, cuius ipse fuerat minister, privatum imperio nexum tenebat.'² Similarly Accolti left out the sections in William that portrayed the miserable state of the Byzantine empire at the time of the crusade,³ as well as those in which William discussed Alexius' treacherous motives for wanting the crusaders quickly to pass beyond Constantinople.⁴ Another example is William's highly coloured portrait of Alexius' representative, Tactitius, which is not included in De bello.⁵ The imprisonment of Hugh the Great might have given an unfavourable impression of Alexius, so that Accolti added to Sanudo's account that Alexius treated Hugh's men at that time amice hospitaliterque in order to show him to somewhat better advantage.⁶

Often, however, Accolti was not so successful in reconciling the requirements of classical imitation and verisimilitude. It has been pointed out that, in the classical tradition, Accolti hoped his history would inspire his contemporaries to virtuous actions, and one individual virtue with which he was especially concerned was concordia. The merits of concord were emphasized by Livy and Sallust⁷ and

1. Recueil, I, p. 79.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 18v (Recueil, V, p. 544).

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 29r seq. (Recueil, V, p. 553) with Recueil, I, pp. 77-9.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31v-32r (Recueil, V, p. 555) with Recueil, I, p. 90.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 56r seq. (Recueil, V, p. 575) with Recueil, I, pp. 186-7.

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 27v (Recueil, V, p. 551) with Sanudo, p. 135.

7. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 69-70; Sallust, BJ, XL1-XLI1.

discussions of it played an important part in political theory during antiquity, the middle ages and the Renaissance.¹ To demonstrate the benefits of concordia and the ill-effects of discordia Accolti frequently made additions to his sources which have little basis in fact or probability. Usually such additions took the form of disagreements between leaders and followers in the crusading army and of the ill consequences that ensued. For example, he added to William of Tyre's account that the men who were massacred by the people of Belgrade had gone foraging in defiance of Walter the Penniless.² Accolti added too that Peter the Hermit, who was in fact far from a skillful leader, opposed the attack on Maleville in Hungary undertaken by his followers. The final result of their disobedience was that when Gottschalk's army, who were the next group of crusaders to follow Peter, passed through Hungary, they were slaughtered by the Hungarians in revenge.³ On the other hand, when followers remained in concordia with their leaders, disaster did not result. Thus, Walter the Penniless was able to persuade his followers not to avenge their comrades who were robbed by the Hungarians, so that the army was able to move on in peace.⁴ Accolti's version is perhaps more convincing when he goes beyond his sources and points out situations in which political rather than military discord was likely to have arisen. Thus he alone indicated that discord among Christian princes enabled Islam to overrun

1. Cicero, De officiis, I, 25; N. Rubinstein, 'Political Ideas in Sienese Art: the Frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Taddeo di Bartolo in the Palazzo Pubblico', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXI (1958), pp. 184 seq.; id. 'Marsilius of Padua and Italian Political Thought of His Time,' in Europe in the Late Middle Ages, ed. J. Hale, R. Highfield, and B. Smalley (London, 1965), pp. 61-62; id. 'Beginnings of Political Thought in Florence', Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, V (1942), pp. 218 seq.; J.N. Warner, 'Political Ideas in Matteo Palmieri's Della vita civile', unpublished M.Phil. thesis, London University, April, 1969, pp. 33 seq.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13r-13v (Recueil, V, p. 540) with Recueil, I, pp. 48-9.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 14r (Recueil, V, p. 541) with Recueil, I, p. 50.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13r (Recueil, V, p.

the East,¹ and he portrayed the discord among the leaders of the crusade over the election of a King of Jerusalem with greater emphasis than William of Tyre had done.²

Because their works had a moral purpose, ancient historians such as Livy and Sallust placed great emphasis on the role of the individual in history, especially that of the leader.³ Similarly Accolti emphasized the importance of the leaders of the crusade more than his sources. He was often able to find situations in which leaders were likely to have exercised greater authority than was indicated by his sources; it is quite possible, for example, that the Papal Legate ordered the crusaders to use the winter after the Council of Clermont to prepare for the crusade, although his role at that time is not made explicit by Accolti's sources.⁴ Accolti was probably correct to assume too that the new Patriarch of Antioch was chosen by the Legate although William of Tyre does not specify by whom he was elected.⁵ Nor was Accolti breaking the laws of truth when he went beyond emphasizing the role of the leaders of the crusade in general, and singled out a few of them for special attention: thus he narrated in detail the arrival of Godfrey and Bohemond at Constantinople, but passed over that of Robert of Flanders,

540) with Recueil, I, p. 48. Other examples of concordia and discordia between leaders and followers added by Accolti: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 22r (Recueil, V, p. 547) -- speech by envoys of Hungarian king; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 66r (Recueil, V, p. 583) -- reaction to Emperor's desertion of the crusaders; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 84r-84v (Recueil, V, p. 598) -- exaggerated reports of the dissension among crusaders reaches Tripoli.

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 3v-4r (Recueil, V, 532-3) with Sanudo, p. 127.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 99v seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 610-11) with Recueil, I, pp. 364-7, 376-7.

3. Cf. Livy, Praef. 9; Walsh, Livy, pp. 82 seq.; Cicero, De oratore, II, 63; Sallust, BC, II, 3-6.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11v (Recueil, V, p. 539) Sanudo, p. 131.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 73r-73v (Recueil, V, p. 589) with Recueil, I, p. 274.

Robert of Normandy and Raymond of Toulouse, of which there had been full treatment in William of Tyre.¹ His desire to stress the importance of leaders may even have prompted him to overcome some of the prejudice against the Muslims from which his sources suffered and point out the virtues of their leaders. Thus in Accolti's version both Kiliç Arslan and the Muslim ruler of Serondj near Edessa appear as greater leaders than in William of Tyre's account.² At other times, however, Accolti's emphasis on the leaders is less convincing. He had little justification for saying that the lowering of Tancred's standard at Tarsus was Baldwin's work, when William of Tyre had stated that the people of Tarsus were responsible.³ Another example is the plot in which an Armenian guard agreed to betray Antioch to the crusaders: it is hardly possible that, ignorant as they must have been of the topography of the fortifications and the routine of the guard, the crusaders could have worked out the details of the plan, as is maintained by Accolti; William of Tyre's version, in which the Armenian was responsible, is far more credible.⁴ Similarly, Accolti's constant emphasis on Godfrey of Bouillon's importance is not easily justified. Thus he inserted as an apology a passage accounting for Godfrey's delay in beginning his expedition;⁵ he alone said that Godfrey went without escort to visit the Emperor in Constantinople, thereby attributing to him greater courage than his source had done.⁶ Similarly when the Em-

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 33v (Recueil, V, p. 556) with Recueil, I, pp. 95-107.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 18v, 47r (Recueil, pp. 544, 567). Cf. Recueil, I, p. 59 and Sanudo, p. 141.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 43v (Recueil, V, p. 564) with Recueil, I, pp. 141-2.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 61v seq. (Recueil, V, p. 579) with Recueil, I, pp. 220 seq.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 27v-28r (Recueil, V, p. 552).

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31r (Recueil, V, pp. 554-5) with Recueil, I, p. 87.

peror's legates came to the host to protest that Antioch had been handed over to Bohemond rather than the Emperor, Accolti said that Godfrey alone received them, whereas William had said that the leaders as a group answered them.¹

Related to the attempt to give history a moral purpose is the exaggerated patriotism characteristic of ancient histories: to enhance their value as exemplars of virtue Livy portrayed the Romans as a master race² and Sallust was prone to similar chauvinism.³ For Accolti the Romans were replaced by the crusaders, and he was sometimes guilty of changing the account found in his sources in order to show them to better advantage. A glaring example is the aftermath of the massacre by the Bulgarians of the foragers from Walter the 'Penniless' army. In William of Tyre's version, the main army simply moved on without seeking vengeance.⁴ Accolti evidently considered this unworthy of the crusaders, and fabricated an entire episode showing how the crusaders avenged themselves on the Bulgarians:

Auditus fugientium et insequentium clamor, visusque simul tot hominum cursu sublatus pulvis ducem a castris cum suis excivit, qui, secum ducens expeditas cohortes, non multum progressus, fugientibus Gallis obviis fuit; redactisque illis ad integram aciem, feroces victoria invadit hostes, fusosque levi certamine usque ad urbem est persecutus, multis in prelio et fuga occisis.⁵

Another example is Accolti's treatment of one of the most unpleasant episodes of the First Crusade: the massacre of the Jews by crusaders passing through Germany. William included a full account of their disgraceful conduct, but Accolti, persistent in his intention of showing the crusaders

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 83v (Recueil, V, p. 597) with Recueil, I, pp. 307-8.

2. Walsh, Livy, p. 64; cf. also ibid. pp. 65 seq., 144 seq., 151 seq.

3. Cf. Sallust, BC, VI-IX; BJ, XLI, 2.

4. Cf. Recueil, I, p. 49.

5. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13v; Recueil, V, p. 540.

to be models of virtue, omitted all mention of it.¹ A third example is Peter the Hermit's reaction to the condition of Jerusalem during his pilgrimage to the East. William did not mention any comparison made by Peter between Westerners and Muslims,² but Accolti inserted such a comparison into his account of Peter's thoughts in order to demonstrate the superiority of Christians over Muslims.³

Livy often included large and exaggerated accounts of the numbers of combatants engaged in battle and of enemy losses,⁴ and Accolti in the same way, with little regard for accuracy, exaggerated the size of crusading armies in order to make the crusades seem to be more on the scale of Roman expeditions. Accolti said, for example, that Baldwin took 6000 cavalry and 10,000 infantry on his Armenian expedition, whereas Sanudo said he took 200 knights and a 'multitudo peditum.'⁵ At one point during the siege of Antioch, Accolti said that 6000 cavalry and 10,000 infantry were put under the command of Godfrey and Baldwin,⁶ but William had said they had only about 700 men.⁷ Accolti also exaggerated the numbers of enemy killed in battle by the crusaders. In one engagement near Antioch, Accolti said

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 21v seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 547-8) with Recueil, I, p. 66.

2. Cf. Recueil, I, pp. 32-4.

3. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 5r-5v (Recueil, V, p. 534). Other examples of patriotic falsifications and additions: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 3r-4r (Recueil, V, pp. 532-3) -- Moslems weak and vicious; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 17r (Recueil, V, p. 543) -- lessens the extent of the defeat of crusaders by the Bulgarians.

4. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 120-1, 144-5.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 46v (Recueil, V, p. 567) with Sanudo, p. 141.

6. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 56v (Recueil, V, p. 575).

7. Recueil, I, p. 195. Other examples: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 22v (Recueil, V, p. 547); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 28v (Recueil, V, p. 553); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 30v (Recueil, V, p. 554); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 88v (Recueil, V, p. 601); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 91v (Recueil, V, p. 604).

that 15,000 Turks fell, but William, only 200;¹ in another battle, Accolti said that 6000 were killed, but William, only 2000.² Occasionally, when William does not cite the size of an army, Accolti supplies an exaggerated figure. William did not say how large Kilij Arslan's army was when he attacked the crusaders outside Antioch, but Accolti gave the figure of 150,000 men.³ Similarly when William does not include the numbers of men fallen in battle, Accolti sometimes gives exaggerated numbers. Thus, he added that 50,000 Persians and 3,000 crusaders fell in the battle between the crusaders and Kerbogha⁴ and in the defeat inflicted on Peter the Hermit by Kilij Arslan he added that the crusaders lost 15,000 men, the barbarians, 2000.⁵ Revealing of Accolti's attitude to numbers are his comments occasioned by a battle between Kilij Arslan and the crusaders near Nicea. He had in fact exaggerated the number of casualties and prisoners: 6000 killed and almost the same number captured, whereas William had cited 4000 killed and a few captured.⁶ Even so Accolti apologized for the small numbers of casualties inflicted by the crusaders: '*minor cedes fugentium fuit, quod silve proxime montesque, in quos hostes refugerant, nostris impedimento ad persequendum fuere, presertim quia locorum ignari erant.*'⁷

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 60r (Recueil, V, p. 578) with Recueil, I, p. 204.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 57r (Recueil, V, p. 575) with Recueil, I, p. 196. Another example: Cod. 54,6, fol. 41v-42r (Recueil, V, p. 563).

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 37r (Recueil, V, p. 559) with Recueil, I, pp. 115-6. Other examples: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 12v-13r (Recueil, V, p. 540); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 57v (Recueil, V, p. 576); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 78r (Recueil, V, p. 592); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 81r-81v (Recueil, V, p. 595).

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 73r (Recueil, V, p. 588) with Recueil, I, pp. 269-73.

5. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 21v (Recueil, V, p. 546) with Recueil, I, p. 116.

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 38r (Recueil, V, p. 560) with Recueil, I, p. 116.

7. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 38r (Recueil, V, p. 560).

of Hugh as the brother of the King of France; and he hoped that the crusaders would bow to the wishes of someone of Hugh's eminence.¹

Nevertheless, Accolti usually expressed his psychological insights in terms of the topoi of deliberative rhetoric, so that his observations often seem conventionalized and less than convincing. For example, he reconstructed the tossing and turning of Bohemond's mind in deciding whether to join the crusade in terms of the complaces utile and honestum. For arguments contra he used the topos utile: it was periculosum to leave his home surrounded by enemies, and intutum to trust himself to the Greeks, who had been expelled from Sicily by his father, Robert Guiscard. For the argument pro, he used the topos honestum: it was flagitiosum to neglect the faith especially when there were so many others who were ready to defend it. In the end, according to Accolti, Bohemond put honestum before utile and joined the crusade.² Another example is the way in which Accolti reconstructs Urban II's state of mind immediately before his oration at Clermont. He thought, said Accolti, it was an opportune moment to call a crusade (utile) and he considered it a worthy act (honestum).³ Robert of St Remy had said that the crusaders swore obedience to Alexius because they were entering a foreign land and faced the possibility of a shortage of supplies.⁴ Accolti rewrote their motivations in terms of deliberative rhetoric: they had come not to conquer but to free the Holy Sepulchre (honestum); they did not want to enter Asia with an enemy at their rear (periculosum); and they thought it unwise to diminish their

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 27v (Recueil, V, p. 551) with Sanudo, p. 135. Other examples: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 6v (Recueil, V, p. 535); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 12r (Recueil, V, p. 539); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 34r (Recueil, V, p. 557); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 34v (Recueil, V, p. 557).

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 24v-25r (Recueil, V, p. 549) with Sanudo, p. 135.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 7v (Recueil, V, p. 536) with Sanudo, p. 131.

4. Recueil, III, p. 749.

numbers by providing guards for conquered cities (temerarium).¹

Conventionalized too were the speeches in oratio obliqua that Accolti included in De bello. In Peter the Hermit's oration to Urban II in favour of a crusade, for example, in which Accolti himself reconstructed all of Peter's arguments except for one also found in William of Tyre's account, he merely went through the appropriate commonplaces of deliberative rhetoric:

necessarium: the plight of Christians in the East requires aid. (found in William), especially as the East was the birthplace of Christianity (added).

gloriosum: it would make Urban II immortal to be the first pope to call a crusade (added).

honestum: as leader of Christendom, it was the pope's duty to lead a crusade (added).

gratum: the crusade would be welcomed by God and mankind (added).²

Another example is the speech made by the King of Hungary's envoys to Gottschalk's men. William of Tyre's simple arguments were free from the embellishments of classical rhetoric: the crusaders, according to his account of the speech, should confide in the King because he would not punish all for the crimes of a few; moreover, they would be unable to escape from the kingdom.³ In Accolti's hands, this becomes a full deliberative oration:

exordium (principium ab auditoribus): the crusaders are in a position to decide whether to have peace or war (added by Accolti).

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31v (Recueil, V, p. 555). Other examples: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 11r (Recueil, V, p. 538); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 13r (Recueil, V, p. 540); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16r (Recueil, V, p. 542); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 17r-17v (Recueil, V, p. 543); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54, 6, fo. 19r (Recueil, V, p. 545); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 28r (Recueil, V, p. 552); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 28v (Recueil, V, p. 552); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31r-31v (Recueil, V, pp. 554-5); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 32r-32v (Recueil, V, p. 555); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 33v (Recueil, V, p. 556).

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 6r-6v (Recueil, V, pp. 534-5) with Recueil, I, p. 35.

3. Recueil, I, pp. 64-5.

tractatio

tutum: they will be safe because the King has heard that the leaders had protested against the crimes of the common soldiers (added); the King does not want to punish the crusaders but only to protect his own subjects (added); he will see that adequate food is provided for the army (added).

necessarium: there is no way out of the Kingdom open to crusaders (taken from William); death will threaten them through lack of food (added).

conclusio: let the crusaders look after themselves now, lest they regret the opportunity when it is too late (added).¹

An important genre in classical historiography were siege descriptions;² Accolti elaborated the siege accounts found in his sources after the pattern found in classical historians with little regard for accuracy or probability. One example is his version of Kilij Arslan's siege and recapture of a town which had been seized by some German followers of Peter the Hermit:

Accolti

Quod ubi Solimanus intellexit (iam enim non procul cum exercitu erat), ulcisci properans cladem acceptam, itineribus magnis ad eos contendit. Cuius adventu Germani attoniti, qui preter spem in hostes inciderant, deficere animis, per vias oppidi velut amentes cursare, tumultuari ad invicem, modo ad defendendum se accingere, modo fugam meditari. Cum vero subire muros viderunt hostem ac totis viribus Persis impares, nec primum impetum ferentes vel cesi sunt in ipsis muris, vel, se ex illis precipitantes, fuge aut latebre locum querebant. Quos persequentes undique hostes, qui iam intus irruperant, omnes ad unum occiderunt, avulsa humeris capita supra pila

William

Ja s'estoient trez près de nostre gent et estoient ès bois et ès montengnes. il oi dire que cil Thyois avoient pris ce chastel et occis sa gent; il vint là au plus tost que il pot et assist le chastel et le reprist sanz demeure: ceus que il trova leanz decoupa touz.

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 22r-22v (Recueil, V, p. 547).

2. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 191-7; Sallust, BJ, XXI-XXVI, XXXVII-XXXVIII, LVI-LXI, LXXVI, LXXXIX-XCI, XCII-XCIV.

gestantes, tantum ira ob detrimentum acceptum et in Christianos inexpiabile odium preter sevitiam insitam, eos commoverat.¹

It is evident from this comparison that Accolti has fabricated the entire description found in De bello. His emphasis on the psychological state of the besieged, their desperate condition (amentes) is reminiscent of Livy's approach.² Another classical addition is the savagery at the end of the siege, when Kiliĵ Arslan kills all the Germans and mutilates their corpses.³ Two more examples may be cited to show how Accolti added to his sources in order to depict the state of mind of the besieged in the same way as Livy had done. In his account of the siege of the Hungarian fortress by the German and French crusaders, Accolti added to William's account a description of the desperation felt by the Hungarians as a result of their recent defeat at the hands of the crusaders: 'recens victoria (of the crusaders) . . . aliis (the Hungarians) vero iniecerat metum, ut qui erant in arce, brevi spatio illam tutantes, tandem pene defensionem desererent.'⁴ Another example may be taken from the siege of Nicea, when a complete blockade was finally achieved by Greek boats which were moved onto the lake behind the city. Accolti added to William of Tyre's account a long description of the citizens' despair at the news of the blockade: all hope was now lost; no way remained open for flight or for external aid; starvation was inevitable unless Kiliĵ Arslan arrived with a relieving force; nevertheless, the fear of the enemy, whom they regarded as implacable, made them carry on.⁵ One last example may be cited

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 19v (Recueil, V, p. 545); Recueil, I, pp. 59-60.

2. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 191-7; Livy, XXXI, 18, 6 and XXI, 14, 1.

3. Cf. Livy, VI, 3,6-9 and XXXI, 23, 7-8; Sallust, BJ, XCI, 6 and XCIV, 6.

4. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 23v (Recueil, V, p. 548); cf. Recueil, I, pp. 67-8.

5. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 39r (Recueil, V, p. 561); cf. Recueil, I, pp. 119-20.

in order to show how Accolti invented an entire episode of a siege account in the classical manner. It is an account of an unsuccessful assault on Nicea by the crusaders, a common genre in classical historiography, for which there is no basis in Accolti's sources:

Hoc prelio facto, duces rati oppidanos ea clade perculsos egrius urbem defensuros, si prius eam oppugnent quam illi ex tanto pavore sese colligant, postero die aggredi menia decreverunt. Ergo, postquam illuxit, instructi omnes subeunt muros, et brevi momento ex parata materia fossas complent, scalaeque multis erigi partibus cepte, per quas in summum evadere promptissimus quisque studebat. Obsessi vero, putantes ex se supplicium, non victoriam peti, minus acerbum fore censebant, si pugnantes occumberent, quam si, diruta urbe, ante ora captarum coniugum liberorumque, inter verbera et vincula, omnia feda atque indigna passi, expirarent. Igitur cum supplicia, mors feda, ruina urbis essent ob oculos, non militaris modo etas aut virilis, sed femine puerique supra corporis atque animi vires aderant, propugnantibus tela ac saxa ministrantes, et ipsi qui erant in muris certamine laboris ac periculi conspectu mutuo accendebantur. Igitur, quanquam vi summa pugnarent nostri et fessis integri sepe succederent, multique hostes vulnerarentur, multi etiam caderent, nec per aliquot horas ulla eis daretur quies, tamen tantus fuit eorum ardor, adeo presens ad pugnam animus, ut nostros tandem castra repetere cogerint; centum ex illis interfectis, quorum pars maior, dum scandit muros vel scalas admovet, saxis est obruta. Quos inter nonnulli fuerunt factis et genere illustres, multi quoque ex prelio saucii discessere. Nec est silendum in ea pugna Goffredi facinus, qui, cum sagittis plures Barbaros confecisset, animadvertens quemdam ex muris procero corpore latine loqui, suosque increpare stultos imbelles vocitantem, sagitta eum transfixum precipitem ex muro dedit.¹

One classical element in this passage is the account of the strategy of the besiegers: to attack the city after the recent defeat of the Turks, before the citizens could collect themselves;² another is the preparations of the besiegers, how they invested the walls, filled the moats, gathered

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 38r-38v (Recueil, V, p. 560); cf. Recueil, I, pp. 117-22.

2. Cf. Sallust, BJ, LVI, 1 and LXXXIX-XCI.

ladders;¹ another is the state of mind of the besieged: it was better to die fighting than to be captured;² another is the vigorous defense by the besieged,³ in which the attackers were killed by weapons hurled from the walls.⁴ Especially classical is Accolti's emphasis on the role of the leader of the besieging army during the siege.⁵ Accolti changed the place of Godfrey's feat in which he shot a Turk off the wall with an arrow, from its location in William of Tyre's history after Nicea had been blockaded, to this unsuccessful attack on Nicea, in order to demonstrate Godfrey's abilities as a leader and a soldier.⁶ Accolti rewrote William's account in order to make Godfrey's actions during the unsuccessful attempt on Nicea seem even more noteworthy; for in William's version, it was the Turk, not Godfrey, who had wounded many enemies with his bow.⁷

Another standard feature of classical historiography were conventionalized battle accounts.⁸ Some of the most conspicuous and least convincing additions in De bello were made to the set battle pieces, in which Accolti attempted to classicize the deeds of the crusaders. One standard classical narrative technique which Accolti often adopted was the division of a battle into stages.⁹ An example is

1. Cf. ibid. XXI 3, XXIII 1, XXV 9, XCII 7-9.

2. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 191-7.

3. Cf. Sallust, BJ, LVII, 5-6 and LX, 1-6.

4. Cf. ibid. LVII, 5-6 and LV, 6-8.

5. Cf. ibid. XXIII, 1 and XC-XCI.

6. Cf. Recueil, I, p. 122.

7. Other examples of classicized siege descriptions in De bello: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 47r-48r (Recueil, V, pp. 567-8) -- Serondj; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 53r seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 572 seq.) -- Antioch; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 76r seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 591 seq.) -- Armenian fortress; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 87r seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 600 seq.); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 89v seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 603 seq.) -- Jerusalem.

8. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 157-163, 197-204; Sallust, BC, LIX-LX; id. BJ, XLVIII-LIII, LXXIV 2-3, XCVIII-XCIX, CI.

9. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 198-9.

the encounter of Peter the Hermit's army with the Bulgarians near Nish. William of Tyre does not mention the stages of the battle,¹ but Accolti divides the fighting into three parts in the Livian manner: primo the front line of the crusaders retreat; tandem, they pull themselves together and join battle; cumque an hour of equal fighting has elapsed the villagers retreat.² Another characteristic feature of Livy's battle accounts was the division of the army into a three-part battle line: right wing, centre, and left wing.³ Accolti frequently imposed this formation on forces for which no such grouping is mentioned in his sources. An example is the engagement between Peter the Hermit's and Kilij Arslan's forces near Nicea. William of Tyre does not mention their battle formation,⁴ but Accolti describes a conventionalized three-part battle line: 'in fronte cornibusque suum equitatum disponunt, cuius latera sagitarii levisque armature pedites cingebant.'⁵ Another example is the battle between the Greeks and the crusaders near Constantinople, where Accolti adds that the crusaders drew up a triple battle line.⁶

Classical authors frequently added to the drama of their battle accounts by introducing a subsidiary force, whose sudden intervention turned the tide of the fighting; fre-

1. Recueil, I, pp. 55-6.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16v (Recueil, V, p. 543). Other examples: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 23r (Recueil, V, p. 548); Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31r (Recueil, V, p. 554).

3. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 161-2, 199.

4. Recueil, I, p. 61.

5. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 20r-20v (Recueil, V, p. 546).

6. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 31r (Recueil, V, p. 554) with Recueil, I, pp. 84-5. Other examples of Accolti's adding emphasis on battle lines and battle formations:--- Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 16v (Recueil, V, p. 543) -- against Peter the Hermit's army; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 32v (Recueil, V, p. 556) -- Bohemond and Tancred against the Greeks; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 37r (Recueil, V, p. 559) -- Kilij Arslan against the Crusaders; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 38r (Recueil, V, p. 560) -- retreat of Kilij Arslan's army.

quently this device took the form of an ambush.¹ Accolti frequently made insidiae and sudden attacks important features in battles, even if there was no foundation for such treatment in his sources. An example is the battle between Kiliġ Arslan and Peter the Hermit's men near Nicea. William of Tyre had said nothing about the Turkish cavalry lying in ambush for the crusaders² but, in Accolti's account, the Sultan hid knights in the forest who attacked the crusaders from behind and put them to flight.³ Another example is Bohemond's march to Constantinople through Yugoslavia; William had only said that he was attacked by the Greeks⁴ but Accolti turned the attack into a full-scale ambush:

Hi ergo, ad exequendum iussum intenti, prope fluvium quendam, Bagdarum tunc ab incolis dictum, suos milites in insidiis locant. Videntesque, die sequenti, Boamundi nepotem, Tancredum nomine, cum parte exercitus amnem transgressum, in alios qui citra flumen remanserant, impetum fecerunt, et a fronte, a tergo, a lateribus circumfusi, ita percussis institere, ut vix colligendi sui expediendique arma facultatem habere.⁵

Cicero had stressed the importance of clarifying

1. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 201-3; Sallust, BJ, XXXVIII 4 seq.; LIV 9-10, LV 8, LVIII, LIX 2-3, XCI 4, XCVII 4-5.

2. Recueil, I, p. 61.

3. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 20r-21r (Recueil, V, pp. 545-6).

4. Recueil, I, pp. 92-3.

5. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 32v (Recueil, V, pp. 555-6). Other examples of ambushes and sudden attacks not found in Accolti's sources: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 32v-33r (Recueil, V, p. 556) -- Tancred's aid saves Bohemond in the battle with the Greeks; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 49r-49v (Recueil, V, p. 569) -- surprise attack of the cavalry allows the Count of Normandy to take the bridge over the Orontes river; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 70r seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 586-8) -- Tancred's sudden attack is the turning point of the battle with Kerbogha; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 81r-81v (Recueil, V, p. 595) -- Count of Toulouse lays an ambush against bandits; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6 fol. 84v (Recueil, V, p. 598) -- the reserve cavalry of the crusaders turns the tide of battle; Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 101v (Recueil, V, p. 612) -- surprise attack is feigned by hidden animals.

the tactics of combatants in battle,¹ and the overall direction of military campaigns was an important feature of Sallust's and Livy's narrative.² Accolti frequently imposed a scheme of tactics on the account of a battle found in his sources, as for example in his account of Peter the Hermit's battle with Kiliġ Arslan: he added that the Sultan chose to fight in a plain because of his superior cavalry, and that the crusaders drew up their battle line in order to be able to resist a strong cavalry.³ Another example is the battle between the Turks and the main crusading army before Nicea, in which Accolti added an account of the crusading army's strategy. After learning they were about to be attacked, orders were given to the camp to prepare for battle, moreguards were posted and each soldier was instructed to remain in his usual post in order to give the Turks the impression that they didnot expect an attack. Part of the army was stationed to keep watch over the nearby villages, all baggage and wagons were put together lest they obstruct the defence; nobody was to mount his horse until the enemy was within sight, in order to keep their horses fresh, andsurprise the Turks.⁴ Cicero had also emphasized that the historian should elucidate the causes of events⁵ and Accolti often specifies the reasons for a victory or a defeat even though they are not explicit in his sources. An example is his account of the battle between the Greeks and Bohemond in Macedonia, in which Accolti invents reasons why at first the Greeks prevailed but in the end succumbed. Had the fighting been longer, he said, the Greeks would have been victorious, because they

1. De oratore, II, 63.

2. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 197, 203; Sallust, BC, LIX; id. BJ, XLVIII-XLIX, XCVII 3, XCVIII 1-5, CI 3-4.

3. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 20r-20v (Recueil, V, p. 546) with Recueil, I, p. 61.

4. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 36v-37r (Recueil, V, p. 559) with Recueil, I, p. 115. Another example: Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 30v-31r (Recueil, V, p. 554).

5. De oratore, II, 63.

outnumbered the Latins and their troops were fresher. In the end, they were put to flight by Tancred whom they had not expected to be present.¹ In the battle between Kilij Arslan and the main crusading army too, Accolti adds the reasons why the Sultan was defeated: his men could no longer resist because they and their horses, many of which had been killed by the Christian infantry, were exhausted.²

Another standard element in classical battle accounts is the emphasis on the role of the leader, a feature which Accolti added to many of the battle descriptions found in his sources. For example, William of Tyre did not mention Bohemond's individual role in the battle between his men and the Greeks,³ but Accolti emphasized Bohemond's crucial contribution:

At Boamundus, ut in re subita satis impavidus, nec animo neque consilio deficere, sed suos ad pugnam hortari, aciem, prout erat facultas, instruere, subsidia laborantibus mittere, unde maius erat periculum ibi adesse, nullum denique ducis officium pretermittere.⁴

Accolti's account is reminiscent of the part played by Catiline in Sallust's description of the battle against Marcus Petreius:

Interea Catilina cum expeditis in prima acie vorsari, laborantibus succerrere, integros pro sauciis arcessere, omnia providere, multum ipse pugnare, saepe hostes ferire; strenui militis et boni imperatoris officia simul exsequebatur.⁵

Accolti even draws closer to Sallust's description of Catiline in his account of Godfrey's part in the battle with the Turks before Nicea. He added that Godfrey exhorted his

1. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 32v-33r (Recueil, V, p. 556) with Recueil, I, pp. 92-3.

2. Cf. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 37v-38r (Recueil, V, p. 560) with Recueil, I, pp. 115-6.

3. Recueil, I, pp. 92-3.

4. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 32v (Recueil, V, p. 556).

5. BC, LX, 4. Cf. BJ, XCVIII, 1-3.

[illegible]

habebant. Ab una item parte dux unus erat ac miles duci maxime fidens, ab altera nemo imperio precellebat; qui vero nobilitate aut prudentia pollebant munere ducum fungebantur, ideoque non satis illis parebant milites, nec ipsi plerumque in idem conveniebant. Que res frequenter ingentium cladium causa fuit. In tanta rerum iniquitate stetisset tamen nostrorum acies, vel saltem diutius fuisset pugnatum, ni hostis a tergo invasisset. Is demum impetus fudit eos, presertim cum ibi nullum equestre presidium esset.¹

Accolti's account, thus, is very full indeed; his source, William of Tyre, however, included only a brief summary of this engagement:

Quant nostre gent furent issuz et les virent soudainement qui ne s'en prenoient garde, si leur corurent sus as lances as espees por venchier la mort leur freres. Li mescreanz virent que la chose estoit acertes et que chascuns se combatoit por sa teste, si les reçurent mout efforcieement. La bataille commença cruïex, et mout en i ot ocis decà et delà, et mout dura longuement. Mès Solimanz avoit mout plus genz qui estoient tuit à cheval, si que li pelerin à pié ne les pooient plus souffrir, einz se desconfirent et se mistrent à la voie sanz conroi et sanz atirement.²

In his account Accolti took only three facts from William of Tyre: that the battle took place in a plain, that the crusaders were outnumbered, and that the Turks had superior cavalry. The rest of Accolti's version is presented in accordance with classical conventions. In the first place, he emphasized the state of mind of the combatants, just as Livy had done:³ the crusaders were fighting not only for glory but for salvation; since they were trapped in a foreign land, they were willing to take on superior numbers of enemy. Secondly, he clarifies the tactics: Kiliç Arslan, he said, ordered his cavalry, which had been stationed on the wings of the battle line, to surround the enemy. Another classical feature is the sudden attack by the Turks from behind, an event upon which the battle hinges. At this

1. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 20v-21r (Recueil, V, p. 546).

2. Recueil, I, p. 61.

3. Walsh, Livy, pp. 162-3, 198.

point Accolti emphasizes the fright suffered by the crusaders, their psychological reactions, as did Livy.¹ Accolti adds too a description of the peculiar tactics of the Turks: they rushed en masse, then suddenly thinned their ranks; now they fought in one spot, now in another. This is a frequent theme in De bello² and is reminiscent of the tactics of the Numidians as described by Sallust.³ At the end, following the Ciceronian canon, Accolti explains the reasons for the Christian defeat. They were outnumbered, unaccustomed to the Turk's unusual manner of fighting; they were fighting in a plain, which allowed greater freedom of movement to the enemy's superior cavalry; and the barbarians had an able military leader, but the Christians had none.⁴

In the Decades, Biondo like Accolti attempted to reconcile the requirements of classical imitation and verisimilitude. Robert of St Remy had never mentioned, for example, that Bohemond actually spoke to the crusaders as they passed through Italy on their way to Dalmatia⁵ but Biondo may have been correct to suppose that such conversations took place, thus adding a conference, a favourite genre of classical historiography, to his account;⁶ similarly Biondo made plausible additions to Robert's account of Bohemond's conversations with the Emperor on his arrival in

1. Ibid. pp. 201-2.

2. Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 27v (Recueil, V, p. 559).

3. Sallust, BJ, L, 4-5.

4. More examples of conventionalized battle accounts:

Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 40v seq. (Recueil, V, p. 562);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 49r seq. (Recueil, V, p. 569);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 55r-55v (Recueil, V, p. 574);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 56v seq. (Recueil, V, p. 575);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 57v seq. (Recueil, V, p. 576);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 58v seq. (Recueil, V, pp. 577-8);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 70r-70v (Recueil, V, p. 586);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 75r seq. (Recueil, V, p. 590);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 81v seq. (Recueil, V, p. 595);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 85r seq. (Recueil, V, p. 598);
 Bibl. Laur., Cod. 54,6, fol. 101v seq. (Recueil, V, p. 612).

5. Cf. Recueil, III, pp. 740-1.

6. Cf. Decades, p. 209.

Constantinople, thereby emphasizing their importance more than Robert had done.¹ Cicero had said that it was the historian's responsibility to clarify the geographical setting of events² and Biondo sometimes provided information in explanation of geography which is not found in his sources: one example is his description of the lands traversed by the Bishop of Le Puy and Raymond of Toulouse,³ another, the details of the position of Nicea.⁴ It has been shown that psychology and motivation were particular concerns of ancient historians⁵ and Biondo frequently went beyond his sources in order to include such observations. He analyzed for example the reasons why the imperial prefect of Dalmatia accompanied the crusaders across his provinces, why Bohemond chose a longer itinerary than previous crusaders, and why Bohemond destroyed the village of heretics in Macedonia.⁶ Similarly neither Biondo's convincing account of the Emperor's reaction when he learned that Peter the Hermit's army had been destroyed, nor of the crusaders' reactions when they learned that Nicea had been surrendered to the Greeks, is found in Robert's account.⁷

Like Accolti, however, Biondo was not always careful in citing numbers. It has been pointed out that classical historians usually provided the numbers of combatants composing an army;⁸ Robert of St Remy did not always give such numbers and Biondo sometimes added them to his account: for example, his figures of 12,000 men who took the cross to follow Bohemond, and who followed Peter the Hermit across the Hellespont, have no source in Robert.⁹ Biondo also

1. Cf. ibid. p. 211 with Recueil, III, p. 748.

2. De oratore, II, 63.

3. Cf. Decades, p. 210 with Recueil, III, pp. 739-40.

4. Cf. Decades, p. 211 with Recueil, III, pp. 755-6.

5. Cf. pp. 222-4 above.

6. Cf. Decades, p. 210 with Recueil, III, pp. 744-5.

7. Cf. Decades, pp. 210, 212 with Recueil, III, pp. 733, 758.

8. Cf. p. 220 above.

9. Cf. Decades, p. 209 with Recueil, III, pp. 732, 742.

elaborated Robert's versions of sieges in the classical manner without much regard for accuracy. He added a description of the machinery used to besiege Nicea,¹ a frequent feature of classical siege descriptions,² and his accounts of the mad desperation of the crusaders besieged in Exersorgon and of the savagery of the Turks in slaughtering all the crusaders in Cinito are reminiscent of Livy.³ Like Accolti Biondo also classicized accounts of battles found in his sources. Godfrey's fortification of his camp before the attack by the Greeks⁴ is reminiscent of Metellus' precautions against Jugurtha;⁵ and Bohemond's desire to march with his men drawn up for battle⁶ may be compared to Metellus' tactics while marching through Numidia.⁷ The role of ambushes in classical battle accounts has been mentioned;⁸ and Biondo, like Accolti, goes beyond his sources to include surprise attacks, such as the ambush prepared by the Emperor for Bohemond,⁹ or the one laid by the Turks for Peter the Hermit.¹⁰ Cicero had stated the importance of explaining the tactics of opponents and of clarifying the reasons for victory or defeat,¹¹ and Biondo, again like Accolti, sometimes added to his sources in order to follow Cicero's dicta, as, for example, in his account of the Turks' tactics of choosing the eastern gate of Nicea against which to direct

1. Cf. Decades, p. 211 with Recueil, III, pp. 755-7.

2. Cf. e.g. Sallust, BJ, XXIII.

3. Decades, p. 210 with Recueil, III, pp. 733-4, 736. Cf. Walsh, Livy, p. 193.

4. Cf. Decades, p. 210 with Recueil, III, pp. 743-4.

5. BJ, XLV, 2.

6. Cf. Decades, p. 211 with Recueil, III, p. 746.

7. BJ, XLVI.

8. Cf. pp. 229-30.

9. Cf. Decades, p. 210 with Recueil, III, p. 746.

10. Cf. Decades, p. 210 with Recueil, III, pp. 733 seq.

11. De oratore, II, 63.

their attack on the crusading armies,¹ or in his discussion of the reasons which led the Turks in Nicea to surrender their city.²

Accolti and Biondo were not the only humanist historians who sometimes allowed the interests of classical imitation to outbalance the requirements of verisimilitude. Leonardo Bruni, often considered the greatest of the humanist historians, sometimes used precisely the same methods as Biondo and Accolti. An example is his account of the battle of Montaperti which is based on Giovanni Villani's chronicle.³ First Bruni went beyond Villani in describing the precise order in which the Germans, Sienese and the Florentine exiles marched out of the town, and in describing the position of the cavalry and infantry, thereby placing greater emphasis, like the classical historians,⁴ on the composition of the battle line. Bruni then gives a fuller and more convincing account than Villani of the emotional and psychological reactions of the Florentines on realizing that they had been betrayed. Whereas Villani simply stated the fact that the Germans attacked the Florentines, Bruni turns this initial attack into a full scale, self-contained Livian episode,⁵ dividing it into distinct stages in the Livian manner: first, the Germans attack and the Guelfs retreat, then Florentine forces rally to the defence, and then the Sienese and exiles join the attack, the advantage again going to the Ghibellines. As Livy frequently did for the Romans, Bruni here went beyond Villani to give the impression that the Florentines had put up a stronger resistance than would appear from Villani's version. In accordance with Cicero's dictum in De oratore, Bruni, unlike Villani, clarifies the reasons why the Ghibellines gained the advantage at this

1. Cf. Decades, p. 211 with Recueil, III, p. 757.

2. Cf. Decades, p. 212. with Recueil, III, p. 758.

3. Cf. Bruni, Historiae, ed. Santini, pp. 39-40 with G. Villani, Cronica, VI, 79.

4. Cf. p. 229 above.

5. Cf. Walsh, Livy, pp. 178 seq.

point: the Florentines were unable to draw up their battle line and were without leadership. Then in narrating the desertion of the Ghibellines from the Florentine side, Bruni again classicizes his account, describing in more detail than Villani the motives which prompted the traitors to desert,¹ and placing greater emphasis on the factional conflict which led to this split in the Florentine ranks.² He gives more details of the personal background of Bucca Abbati and Jacopo Pazzi, thereby imitating the biographical emphasis of classical historiography; he also further develops Abbati's motives for assaulting Pazzi. Again, in accordance with Cicero, he expands Villani's explanation of why Florentines took flight after the desertion, accounting in detail for the significance of the loss of the standard. He also modifies Villani's version of the retreat to show the Florentines in a better light: 'cedentes magisquam superati'. Bruni completely fabricated the episode of the carroccio, again to show the Florentine effort in a more favourable light. Bruni's version of the speeches made by the Florentines in order to encourage their comrades to resist is based on two classical figures of speech: 'ne curram illum ac signa, per tot iam bella victricia, turpi fuga deserent' (contrarium) and 'praestare denique pro patria mori, quam tantae infamiae superesse' (contentio). Finally, like Accolti and Biondo, Bruni exaggerates the numbers of casualties: Villani said that 2,500 died and 2,500 were taken prisoner, but in Bruni's version, 3,000 were killed and 4,000 were captured.

On balance, it must be conceded that in De bello the interests of verisimilitude were outweighed by those of classical imitation, and that Accolti was not the only humanist historian to face the problem of reconciling their requirements. The humanists' effort to provide a convincing account of the past was limited by the literary form in which they wrote. Classical histories were stories; the difference between history and fiction was one of content, not form.

1. Cf. pp. 222-4 above.

2. On discordia, cf. pp. 215-7 above.

The humanists, as well as their ancient predecessors, were obliged to expound the truth in a form which was better suited to the narration of fiction. They had little scope to evaluate evidence, to weigh probabilities, to put the pro and contra of an argument; for such discussion would tend to detract from the flow of the story.

At the beginning of this chapter it was asked how well the humanist historians, and in particular Benedetto Accolti, were able to live up to the heritage of classical historiography. In one sense they were eminently successful: they were able to give their works an almost perfectly classical appearance. Their efforts to classicize their histories went beyond form; they even included events and facts which might equally well have been found in the works of Livy or Sallust. But this effort to classicize their works was, at one and the same time, their achievement and their downfall. For classical historiographical theory had always stressed the importance of truth in history; above all else, history was supposed to be the 'lux veritatis'. In their attempt to give their works a classical appearance, Accolti and some of the other humanists went beyond the limits of truth. It must be admitted, however, that the fault was not fundamentally their own. It was because of the inherent contradictions of the classical tradition, because the ancients themselves had never been able to reconcile the demands of eloquence and truth, that some of their humanist followers failed in their attempt to revive classical historiography.

CONCLUSION

The study of Benedetto Accolti illuminates a great many aspects of life in Renaissance Italy. His career and his family history show the advantages a family of intellectuals could command in Renaissance society. The history of his family provides the occasion for a study of the social and economic relations which existed between Florence and its dominions during the fifteenth century. Accolti's own life serves to point out the importance of Arezzo as an intellectual centre during the Renaissance and a study of his career as chancellor clarifies the nature of the Florentine chancellorship. His own contribution to the chancellery was to restore orderly administration after a period of neglect; he introduced more humanist procedures into the chancellery, and his reforms prepared the way for the more extensive changes inaugurated by his successor, Bartolomeo Scala.

Accolti was not one of the great Florentine humanists. His Dialogue unmistakably shows the extent to which ideas, under the influence of rhetoric, could become schematic and exaggerated, and De bello demonstrates undeniably crude historical methods. Yet Accolti's shortcomings as a writer are in themselves significant; for they reveal some of the characteristics of humanism which the genius of a Leonardo Bruni or a Lorenzo Valla obscures. Bruni's works too suffered from rhetorical exaggeration but because of his extraordinary talents he is able to convince the reader that what he is saying is not banal. And even Bruni is guilty of some humanist historical malpractices which modern historians, dazzled by his exceptional powers, usually fail to point out. The same can be said of Valla's famous exposé of the Donation of Constantine. For centuries opponents of the papacy had been saying it was a forgery; but because Valla was such a master of the art of rhetoric he was able to make the commonplace seem memorable, with the result that today he is usually given the credit for unmasking the forgery. Accolti himself was no such genius and in his works the faults and failings which are typical of humanism, as well as its virtues, are not overshadowed.

Accolti's work as a humanist moreover exhibits a remarkably wide range of interests. He was attracted not only, like many of his fellow humanists, to the study of classical authors, ancient rhetoric and the Italian language, but turned to the history of the early church and its relation to modern Christianity, a subject of study rare among the early humanists. His interest in non-Italian medieval history is almost without parallel among his contemporaries. Indeed, only Flavio Biondo showed a similar interest in early medieval history. It is also difficult to think of another Quattrocento humanist who shared Accolti's curiosity with the East. One can only regret that Accolti did not live to gain greater command of the art of history, so that he could have done more justice to his wide ranging interests. But regardless of his own shortcomings, Benedetto Accolti's life and works illustrate the variety of interests, opportunities and stimulations that were present in fifteenth-century Florence.

APPENDIX I

TABLE I: Commercial investments of the richest men in Arezzo according to the Catasto of 1427-9

<u>Head of household</u>	<u>Valsente to nearest florin</u> (Source: ASF, Catasto, 273)	<u>Type of business</u>	<u>Source</u>
Messer Gregorio Marsuppinini	13,049	Investments in many large Florentine firms. His son was a partner in a wool shop with Conte Mariotto Griffolini.	ASF, Catasto, 203, fol. 644v-647r.
Francesco di Baccio	10,147	Apothecary's shop. General merchandise shop (<u>fondaco</u>).	Ibid. fol. 359r, 372r.
Michele di Conte Marsuppinini	5758	General merchandise shop (<u>fondaco</u>).	Ibid. 201, fol. 550r.
Tuccerello di Cecco	5592	Cloth shop.	Ibid. 202, fol. 613r, 638r.
Conte Mariotto di Biagio Griffolini	4823	Wool shop in partnership with Chiaromano di Gregorio Marsuppinini. Bank in partnership with Pippo di Piero di Dottino. Apothecary's shop (in the form of an <u>accomanda</u>). <u>Accomanda</u> at Ancona	Ibid. 201, fol. 333r-334r, 335r; <u>ibid.</u> 202, fol. 122r, 123r, 124v.
Lippo di Ser Niccolo	3561	Type of bottega is unspecified.	Ibid. 201, fol. 295r.
Jacopo di Tome	2723	Bank. Partnership with Adovardo di Messer Francesco d'Arezzo, which was dissolved shortly after 1427 because of Adovardo's death.	Ibid. fol. 988r.
Heirs of Agnolo di Biagio da Pantaneto	2532	Cloth shop.	Ibid. 202, fol. 406v.

Heirs of Van- ni di Ser Nic- colo	2489	Portata not extant	
Antonio di Donato da Pan- taneto	2082	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 200, fol. 17r-33r.
Paulino di Messer Nic- colo	2007	Business in Avignon and Rome, type unspecified.	<u>Ibid.</u> 202, fol. 153r- 153v.
Francesco di Ghirigoro di Giovanni	1920	Cloth shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 199v.
Monna Mattea di Simone di Ghino	1705	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 769r- 776v.
Messer Miche- le di Santi degli Accolti	1584	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 351r- 359v.
Agnolo di Bar- tolomeo	1524	He has a shoe shop; his sons have a wool shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> 200, fol. 194r- 202v.
Urbano di Gui- do	1389	Wool shop in partner- ship with the heirs of Simo di Panco.	<u>Ibid.</u> 202, fol. 573v, 578v.
Nanni and Ser Paolo di Ser Bartolomeo	1388	Silk shop in partner- ship with Agnolo di Gio- nta. Unspecified partnership with Giovanni di Ser Antonio.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 985r, 986r.
Nanni and Bar- tolomeo di Mat- teo	1353	Wool shop. Butcher's shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> fol. 1135r-1142v.
Guaspere di Maestro Cecco	1338	Wool shop. 2/3 of an apothecary's shop in partnership with Donato di Piero.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 821r, 823r.
Andremo di Lan- duccio Alber- gotti	1329	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 200, fol. 440r- 443v.
Giovanni di Nicola Sinigar- di	1316	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 657r-- 658v, 663r- 664v.

Nanni di Jacopo	1275	Sword maker's shop. Wool shop run by two of his sons. Silk shop, in which another son is a partner with Buono di Giovanni.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 1008r, 1015r.
Giuliano di Agnolo di Maggio	1263	Apothecary's shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 688r, 697r.
Buono di Giovanni	1236	Silk shop in partnership with Cosimo di Nanni.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 1015r.
Monna Mattea fu di Carcastione di Duccio	1236	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> fol. 491r-496r, 497v.
Damiano di Giovanni di Marzo	1173	Cloth shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 158r-165v.
Cristofano del Tortello	1154	Type of business unspecified.	<u>Ibid.</u> 200, fol. 1071r-1076v.
Pippo di Piero di Dottino	1146	Bank in partnership with Conte Mariotto di Biagio Griffolini.	<u>Ibid.</u> 202, fol. 122r, 123r.
Antonio di Ser Giovanni	1136	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 200, fol. 138r-144r, 150r-152r.
Agnolo di Giovanni	1125	Silk shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> fol. 324r.
Mariotto di Bettino.	1123	Wool and leather shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 525r-530r.
Francesco di Messer Giovanni di Ser Baldo	1091	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 346r-354v.
Piero di Giovanni di Ser Agnolo	1090	Cloth shop.	<u>Ibid.</u> 202, fol. 174r, 179r, 182v.
Heirs of Mariotto di Nanni	1054	Wool shop in partnership with Giovanni di Antonio di Pace.	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 209r.
Jacopo di Niccolotto Alberti	1015	No business.	<u>Ibid.</u> 201, fol. 19r-21v.
Giovanni di Ser Antonio	1015	Haberdasher's shop. Shoe shop in partnership with Agnolo di Nanni	<u>Ibid.</u> 203, fol. 665r.

TABLE II: The distribution of wealth in Arezzo according to the Catasto of 1427-9

<u>Valsente</u> <u>to the nearest florin</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>Percentage of</u> <u>the total num-</u> <u>ber of households</u>
1000 or more	35	2.8
999 - 750	14	1.2
749 - 500	45	3.8
499 - 250	140	11.8
249 - 1	818	67.9
0	138	11.7

Source: ASF, Catasto, 273.

TABLE III: Distribution of wealth among lawyers in Arezzo according to the Catasto of 1427-9.

<u>Valsente to the nearest florin</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1000 or more	2	18
999 - 750	1	9
749-- 500	0	0
499 - 250	4	36
249 - 1	4	36
0	0	0

Source: ASF, Catasto, 273.

TABLE IV: The population of the city of Arezzo

<u>Year</u>	<u>Hearths</u> ¹	<u>Approximate population</u> ²	<u>Source</u>
1387	1645	6500	Varese, 'Condizioni', pp.62-3.
1390	1776	7200	<u>Ibid.</u>
1393	1410	5600	<u>Ibid.</u>
1423	1166	4500	<u>Ibid.</u>
1427-9 ²	1191	4500	ASF, Catasto, 273.
1436	1336	5300	Varese, 'Condizioni', pp.62-3.
1443	1087	4300	<u>Ibid.</u>
1450	1110	4500	<u>Ibid.</u>
1458	1128	4500	<u>Ibid.</u>
1467	1217	4900	<u>Ibid.</u>
1480	1274	5100	<u>Ibid.</u>
1490	973	3900	<u>Ibid.</u>
1533	1377	5500	<u>Ibid.</u> p. 56.
1551		6918	Beloch, <u>Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens</u> , vol. II, p. 172.

Notes

1. The numbers of hearths are based on numbers of households assessed for various taxes. Varese assumes that the indigent or miserabili were excluded from the lists of the lira ('Condizioni', pp. 57-9), but he himself gives evidence that they were included: 'nè vi mancano pauperes e miserabiles', he says, 'qua e là alirati.' ('Condizioni', p. 49; cf. also pp. 62-3) Further evidence that they were included is that the number of households in the lira of 1423 and the Catasto of 1427-9 are nearly the same. The Catasto of 1427-9 for Arezzo certainly included miserabili, since, in the Sommario of the Catasto (ASF, Catasto, 273) which lists the taxable capital assets of each household, 11.7% of them have no capital assets. (Cf. Table II above)

2. The Catasto of 1427, according to the Ordine del Catasto, (ASF, Catasto, 2) was imposed on five groups: (1) Florentine citizens, (2) residents of the Florentine contado, (3) residents of the Florentine distretto, (4) foreigners living in the Florentine dominion, and (5) clerics. Actually, there were six categories, as the tax ordered for Pisa in 1428 was conducted differently from the rest of the distretto. The city of Arezzo was included in the third group. Accordingly, its Catasto included all permanent residents of the city and excluded anyone included in the other categories. Residents of the campanie, cortine and contado of Arezzo (cf. p. 27, note 3 above) were taxed separately. Therefore, the number of households according to the Sommario (ASF, Catasto, 273) consists only of permanent residents.

3. Beloch, Bevölkerungsgeschichte, vol. I, p. 4 maintained that from the fifteenth to the early seventeenth centuries the average size of an urban household in Italy was six. He relied, however, almost entirely on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century evidence, and he ignored regional variations.

The following is a comparison of the sizes of households in Tuscan cities, 1350 - 1450:

<u>City</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Hearths</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Average number of members of household</u>
Pisa	1428-9	1731	7469	4.37 ⁱ
San Gimignano	1427-9	314	1269	4.01 ⁱ
Volterra	1380	1272	4409	3.41 ⁱⁱⁱ
	1412	1003	3619	3.5
	1416	1018	4888	4.8
	1420	968	4838	5
	1422	915	3983	4.3
	1427	890	3793	4.2
	1427bis	785	3177	4.04
	1429	802	3371	4.2
	1438	781	3154	4.0
	1446	800	4112	5.1
	1455	736	4007	5.4
	1463	775	4457	5.7
Florence	1380	13,047	54,747	4.19 ^{iv}
	1427	10,171	37,225	3.65 ^v
Pistoia	1427	1247	4468	3.6 ^{vi}
Prato	1428-9	951	3533	3.7 ^{vii}

This suggests that a fair estimate of the average size of an urban household in Tuscany at this time would be four.

(Notes:

i. Catasto, 1428-9 in B. Casini, 'Aspetti della vita economica e sociale di Pisa dal catasto del 1428-29', Bollettino storico pisano, XXXI-II (1962-3), p. 9. On p. 10, note 14, Casini argues that the poorest families were excluded from the Catasto lists, giving as evidence families inhabiting houses in Pisa whose names do not appear in the

Catasto. But then on the table opposite p. 32 he says that 12.07% of the population had no capital assets. It makes no sense to make up a category of people poorer than the poorest. They must rather be accounted for by an oversight of the officials, or by ineligibility for the Catasto on the grounds that they were not permanent residents.

ii. Catasto, 1727-9, in Fiumi, Storia economica . . . di San Gimignano, p. 171.

iii. Sal delle bocche for all years except 1429, which is the Catasto, in E. Fiumi, 'Il computo della popolazione di Volterra nel medioevo secondo il "sal delle bocche" ', Archivio storico italiano, CVII (1949), pp. 6, 10, 13. Except in 1427bis and 1429, the population consists of residents of the city, sobborghi, pendici (the area of the city just outside the city walls), and citizens living in the comitato. 1427bis has been cited to be compared with the Catasto of 1429, which consisted only of the city and sobborghi. Fiumi has also allowed for certain poste which, in the 'Sal delle bocche', were included in the pendici, but which, in the Catasto, were included in the city. (Ibid. pp. 6-7, note 10)

iv. Estimo of 1380, in Delizie, vol. XVI, pp. 123-4. N. Rodolico, La democrazia fiorentina nel suo tramonto (1378-1382), (Bologna, 1905), p. 42 and G. Pardi, 'Disegno della storia demografica di Firenze', Archivio storico italiano, LXXIV (1916), pp. 62 seq., say that the indigent were not included in the recension of this estimo. But E. Fiumi, 'La demografia fiorentina nelle pagine di G. Villani', Archivio storico italiano, CVIII (1950), pp. 106-9, distinguishes how the estimo was conducted from the prestanza: for the former, a list of all citizens, including the miserabili, was drawn up; while for the latter a preliminary list of miserabili who were not to be considered in the levy was made, and upon this was based the final list of those eligible.

v. Catasto of 1427, hearths from G. Canestrini, La scienza, p. 151. Population from Pagnini, Della decima, vol. I, table opposite p. 232. Canestrini and Beloch, Bevölkerungsgeschichte, vol. II, p. 148, say that the population should be adjusted for miserabili. But cf. E. Fiumi, 'Fioritura e decadenza dell'economia fiorentina', Archivio storico italiano, CXVI (1958), pp. 466-7.

vi. Catasto of 1427, in D. Herlihy, Medieval and Renaissance Pistoia (New Haven, 1967), pp. 75-6.

vii. Fiumi, 'Stato di . . . Prato', p. 282.

APPENDIX II

Two versions of the Pratica of 24 February 1461 (Source:
ASF, CP, 56)

Rough version

/fol. 160r_7

die 24 Februarii 1460

Dominus Mannus
Dominus Otto
Franciscus Ventura
Johannes Bartolini
Bernardo de Medicis
Loisius Ridolfi
Lodovicus Cecis
Loisius Guicciardinus¹

Dominus Mannus dixit verba sua futura brevia, quoniam materia requirit brevitatem sermonis, quoniam que petit pontifex denigari /sic_ non potest. Preterea posse ipsum adhibere remedia que nobis obirentur et cogerent cives ad mutandam opinionem. Esse preterea civitatem in magna felicitate quam unquam fuerit. Et aparere /sic_ presertim ex navigatione triremenium que cum magna reputatione reversure sunt. Procedere vero felicitatem ex pluribus, id est, ex bona ministaratione /sic_ iustitie et gubernatione civitatum. Accedere preterea benevolentiam omnium principum qui circa sunt, que, si servabitur, continuo civitas in pace futura est. Ergo ad conservandam eam opus esse id agere ut illis non displiceatur et que sunt cesaris cesari et domini domino dentur. Itaque pertinentia ad pontificem illi non deniganda modo aliquo.

Dominus Otto dixit se concordem esse cum his que dixit Dominus Mannus et cum eo bene agendum esse. Meminisse preterea anno preterito fuisse de hoc consultatum et promissum ut exigarentur decime. Nec esse parem conditionem Florentinorum et aliorum cum pontifice ob plures causas et pertinere ad eos consentire pontifici et honorem in eo versari. Et dedecus in contrarium et onus apud omnes christianos hoc intelligentes. Itaque videri sibi omnino consentendum pontifici.

Franciscus Ventura dixit existimasse se pecunias istas inde exactas esse, attenta deliberatione facta anno preterito. Nec posse contradici his que per alios consultata sunt, actentis di c tis aliorum et utilitate civitatis. Ita se assentiri omnino.

Franchus Sachettus dixit se esse eiusdem iudicii cuius alii locuti sunt. Qui certam ab aliis gratiam et obsequium petunt, debunt illa facere. Audisse se quoque papam fuisse in dispositione ut prohibeat mercaturam apud barbaros. Si ergo negaretur, prohiberet navigationem in damnum civitatis. Et se et assentiri.

Dietisalvius dixit videri sibi idem quod aliis, id est, ut pontifex complaceatur. Utile esse et sapiens consultum.

Loisi Guicciardinus dixit opus esse consilium adaptari tempori et qualitati temporum. Itaque sequendum esse aliorum consilium.

Lodovicus Ciecis dixit se in omnibus concordem esse cum his que per Dominum Mannum et Dominum Ottonem.

Bernardus Medix aprobare se dicta per Dominum Manum esse. Preterea utile cum his qui non adesse possunt consilium habere.

Loisius Rodulfi dixit se aprobare dicta per alios cum cum /sic_ Joanne Caisiano et autem Antonio.

/fol. 160v_

Io Manno Temperani sono chontento a quanto di sopra è chonsigliato.

Io Octo di Lapo Nicholini doctor legum sono contento a quanto di sopra è consigliato.

Io Franco di Niccol Sacchetti sono contento quanto di sopra è consigliato.

Io Dietisalvi di Nerone di Nigi sono contento di quanto di sopra è consigliato.

Io Luigi di Piero Ghuicardinisono contento a quanto di sopra è stato consigliato.

Io Lodovicho di Ciecie da Verazano sono chontento a quanto di sopra è consigliato.

Io Luigi Ridolfi afermo chome sopra.

Io Giovanni Chancisiani son chontetto chome di sopra.

Io Antonio di Puccio son chontento chome di sopra.²

Notes

1. Written in the left-hand margin.

2. Not written by the scribe, but by each person named.

Finished version

[fol. 140v_7]

Die xxiii Februarii 1460

Proposuit Magnificus Dominus Vexillifer venisse ad dominos pontificis nuntium cum suis litteris petentem ut exactas decimas in florentino agro a clericis pontifici dari permitterent. Ipsum enim habere in animo cogere pecunias ex eiusmodi decimis ab omnibus clericis non ob aliam causam nisi ut expeditionem in teucros Mantue destinatum prepararet pro salute christiani nominis. Nec debere sibi amico pontifici rem hanc negari que nulli alteri negata est, utpote pro comuni causa nitenti et clericorum omnium legiptimo domino. Quamobrem convocasse dominos ipsos cives ut ex eis intelligant quid respondendum videatur presertim cum alias pontifici assensa civitas sit ut eiusmodi pecunias exigeret.

Dominus Mannus dixit rem hanc longiorem orationem non poscere quoniam satis cuique patere potest petitionem pontificis adeo iustam et equam esse, ut honeste negari nullo modo queat. Omnes enim scire ac fateri pontificem potestatem habere de clericis quemadmodum velit statuendi. Unde non posse illi negari quin decimas ab illis exigat presertim ob causam tam honestam que ad omnes pertineat. Ac satius esse libenter cives illi obsequi quam coactos postea et invitos mutare voluntatem. Habere enim pontificem remedia plurima quibus cum ignominia et dedecore compeleret civitatem ut sibi obtemperaret. Que cum felix sit ob [fol. 141r_7] plurimas causas quoniam in pace est et iuste ac sapienter regitur quodque omnes finitimi domini et principes eidem amicitia adiuncti sunt, laborandum vehementer esse ne talis ac tanta felicitas aliqua ex parte auferatur. Id vero facile fieri posse, si pax et iustitia domi maneat, foris vero benivolentia conservetur. Non ergo irritari pontificem oportere ne hostis pro amico efficiatur. Et que pontificis sunt illi danda esse, que vero ad nos pertinent conservanda.

Dominus Otto dixit se concordem esse in eandem sententiam, presertim quia preterito anno cum de huiusmodi re agitatum esset, vehementer inter plurimos cives, tandem omnes assensi sunt ut pontifici exactio decimarum permitterentur, nec capiendum exemplum esse ab aliis plurimis qui hoc denegarent. Aliam enim esse cum pontifice Florentinorum conditionem, aliam aliorum esse ob plurimas causas, quas exprimere non sit opus. Quod si illi pergant contradicere voluntati pontificis, scandalum et discordiam nasci posse, ex quibus nil aliud nisi pernities evenire posset civitati, duabus rebus in consultatione propositis quarum una detrimentum prope certum, altera vero pacem et benivolentiam atque honorem allatura sit. Nemo dubius esse debet quin utilis via capienda sit atque inutilis respuenda, presertim quia honor magnus erit Florentinis dominis liberaliter consensisse ut pro tam pia et honorabili causa decime a suis clericis exigerentur. Ideoque videri sibi omnino pontificis voluntati obtemperandum esse.

Franciscus Ventura ait credidisse se pecunias istas quas nunc pontifex petat iam illum habuisse, quoniam ut eas habere posset iam cives omnes consenserunt. Nec posse contradici ad ea que petit quoniam alias per omnes cives promissa sunt. Ideo quod sibi idem videri quod alii, presertim ob civitatis honorem et utilitatem.

Johannes Bartolus dixit honesta videri sibi per pontificem petita et ideo fienda omnino esse.

Franchus Sacchettus dixit consuesse hanc rem publicam sepe-numero ab aliis dominis obsequia plurima petere atque optare, nec spem esse alios eidem placituros, nisi et ipsi domini /fol. 141v/ in rebus honestis plerumque aliis morem gerant. Nec quenque refragari posse quoniam iusta et honesta pontifex petat ob ea que ab aliis discussa sunt. Et imminere periculum si pape domini non assentirentur. Agitatum enim semel Mantue apud illum fuisse ut mercatores omnes ad barbaros cum mercibus navigare prohiberentur, et vix pontificem ab eo proposito mutatum fuisse. Quod si nunc pergerent homini negare illi decimarum solutionem facile ipse indignatione commotus ad prohibendam nobis navigationem incitaretur cum maximo danno ac dedecore civitatis, que ex eiusmodi exercitio plurimum fructum capit. Unde videri sibi omnino pontifici adsentendum.

Dietisalvius breviter dixit se cum aliis concordem esse ut pontifici domini assentiantur.

Loisius Guicciardinus ait se semper intellexisse a prudentibus viris consilia hominum temporibus accomodanda esse. Satis vero patere conducere nunc civitati pacem habenti ne iratum pontificem habeat ob ea negata que honesta negari non potuerint. Ideoque se aliorum consilia sequi.

Lodovicus Cecis aprobavit aliorum sententiam.

Bernardus Medix eidem sententie assensus est addens etiam cum his qui adess. nequerunt consilium capiendum esse.

Loisius Rodulfus pro se et Joanne Canisiano loquens idem aprobavit in omnibus.

Et se omnes manu propria superscripti subscripserunt sicut.

APPENDIX III

- A. Accolti's letter to Cosimo de' Medici, 30 July 1459
(ASF, MAP, CXXXVIII, 19)

Clarissime vir pater et domine, ^{mi} precipue Bernardo da Castilglioncho chiese una lectera al Re Renato, et deliberossi perchè Messer Octo mi disse che vj pareva, et disse l'effecto dela lectera. Par mello avere scripto in buona forma et, come vederete, non si confessa in tucto Bernardo esser fuor di colpa, ne anche s'accusa. Mandovela, et se vi par da mutar nulla, avisatemj et farassj. Bernardo ^{la} sollecita molto et vorrebbe la oggj. In ongnj modo valete felix et diu.

Servitor vester,

Benedictus de Aretio, doctor

- B. Accolti's letter to King René on behalf of Bernardo da Castiglionchio; 30 July 1459 (ASF, Miss., 42, fols. 146r-147r)

Regi Renato

Bernardus Castilionchus nostre urbis civis, cum diu pro pontifice adversus barbaros cum triremi una militasset, egregie quidem viris armisque instructa, tandem parumper navem ac bellum deserere pontificemque ipsum sequi coactus, preposito triremi regende Petro quodam Ramundi Mannelli filio, Mantuam urbem profectus est. Qui quidem Petrus, fidem illi datam valere sinens, avaritia et ambitione amens factus, cum ea predas undique agere, christianosque homines adoriri cepit. Captisque nonnullis eorum lembis, pretiosas merces in illis repertas diripuit. Et secundo ut ipse censeret, successu elatus, maiora in dies moliri nuntiatur, fidei semel date, sui honoris, decoris nostri, omnis denique humani et divini iuris non satis memor. Primus quidem nostrorum civium piraticum exercere ausus, cuius indignum scelus Bernardus ipse, invito eo, patratum dicens, gravissime questus est, nedum se navis iacturam fecisse, sed, quod multo gravius est, integre fame atque opinionis, quoniam a multis creditum est, veri forsitan ignaris, non absque eius assensu Petrum ipsum ad hec ipsa flagitia mentem ac vires convertisse. Que ne infamia serpat sed extinguatur potius, utque sicut inceperat cum sua navi bellum gerere possit adversus comunes christianorum hostes, Petri vestigia ubique insequi navemque illi adimere instituit, necnon illum cogere, si modo facultas aderit, ad ea reddenda omnia que per iniuriam et scelus abstulisset. In qua sane re difficili sibi atque ardua intelligit frustra se ipsum niti, nisi eidem vestra Maiestas opem ferre instituerit, quoniam fama est Petrum ipsum plerumque vestros portus petere, inque illis frequenter versari solitum. Quamobrem celsitudinem vestram oratam volumus, ut huic civi nostro iusta petenti atque honesta nequaquam desit, sed solita clementia et virtute illi rem suam reposcenti auxilium ferre non indignetur, ut intelligant cuncti vos prestantissimum regem iustitiam imprimis colere, ac nulli hominum generi magis infestum

esse quam his qui vite fortunisque hominum vim et insidias --
tendere consueverunt, quoniam sceleribus suis omnis iura so-
cietatis diremissent. Quicquid vero Maiestas vestra in hac
re illi favoris aut auxilii impendet, nos loco ingentis
gratie recipiemus. 30 Julii 1459.

APPENDIX IV

Pratica concerned with increasing Accolti's salary as chancellor (Source: ASF, CP, 56)

[fol. 138v_7

Die v februarii 1460

Magnificus. . . Vexillifer Justitie dixit. . . videri preterea dominis aliquid agendum esse de augendo salario Domini Benedicti cancellarii, nec in his quicquam eos decreturos absque illorum assensu et consilio.

Franciscus Ventura. . . super negotio cancellarii dixit gratum esse opus ei salarium augere qui bonam operam prestat nec mercedem bene expensam caram unquam videri posse.

Dominus Mannus. . . super salario cancellarii augendo dixit proverbium esse vulgatum mercedem institoris boni aut discipuli numquam caram fuisse. Ideoque cum ipse virtuose serviat videri sibi iuxta eius virtutes retributionem fiendam esse ac salarium augendum.

Dominicus Martellus. . . dixit de salario autem Domini Benedicti dixit idem videri sibi quod aliis. Neminem enim fuisse in eo loco qui diligentius et melius se habuit. Et reliquit exercitium advocationis sibi maxime utile. Et ideo salarium eius omnino augendum esse.

Dominus Otto dixit. . . debere autem Domini Benedicti idem se quod alios sentire, presertim cum reliquerit exercitium advocationis et optime satisfaciât. Et ideo videri sibi [fol. 139r_7 centum florenos addendos esse salario veteri.

Johannes Bartolus dixit. . . cumque omnes cives pariter efferant laudibus cancellarium ipsum equum esse ut salarium illi augeatur, cuius officium magis prodest civitati quam sibi.

Franchus Sacchectus ait. . . nec satis de virtute cancellarii digne dici posse cui, cum reliquerit sua exercitia, de maiori salario censere providendum esse, sicut alli dixerunt.

Dietisalvius Neronis. . . cancellarium autem dixit esse hominem valde prestantem. Et ideo nedum sibi pro salario centum florenos augendos esse sed longe maiorem quantitatem, sicut dominis visum fuerit.

Loisius Guicardinus in cunctis aprobavit aliorum sententiam presertim de cancellario, affirmans cedere ad honorem civitatis maximum talem virum eiusmodi officium gerere. Et ideo salarium eius augendum.

Bartolomeus Lonzius. . . ait. . . addens quoque officium cancellariatus neminem unquam talem fuisse qualem nunc sit. Et ideo gratitudinem esse magnam salarium illi augere sicut alii dixerunt.

Vannes Oricellarius. . . quantum ad cancellarium ait quotidie

magis patere eius virtutem. Et quemad [fol. 140r] modum boni principes eruditos viros locupletes reddebant, sic de ipso fiendum esse et ideo salarium eius augendum esse.

Nicola Caponus ait. . . Domino Benedicto augendum salarium florenis 150.

Bernardus Medix aprobare se ait aliorum sententiam. . . de cancellario. Fidem enim illius et virtutem emi non posse.

Loisius Rodulfus idem dixit quod alii circa omnes partes consultationis, addens solitum esse Dominum Benedictum longe plus lucrari ex patrocinio quod prestare solitus erat quam ex hoc munere publico. Et mereri suam doctrinam omne premium. Nec posse illi satisfieri iuxta meritum.

Mariottus Benvenutus similiter aprobavit aliorum dicta addens quotidie crescere bona opera cancellarii et ideo illum retributionem mereri sicut alii dixerunt.

Matteus Palmerius idem in omnibus aprobavit, affirmans omnia mereri Dominum Benedictum et ideo se cum aliis concordem esse ut salarium illi augeatur.

Angelus dela Stufa aprobavit aliorum sententiam, dicens inter alia non posse constitui cancellarium dignum premium sue virtutis et consuesse premia impellere homines ad virtutem maiorem capessendam. Et ideo illi augendum salarium ut melior quotidie efficiatur spe premii.

Leonardus Bartolinus confirmare se ait aliorum dicta, presertim quanto ad Dominum Benedictum, dicens eum omnem salarium mereri.

Petrus Pazius aprobans aliorum sententiam, dixit non posse tantum laudari cancellarium et affici premiis quin etiam maiora mereatur. Et ideo se cum aliis concordem esse ut salarium ei augeatur.

Antonius Puccius aprobavit sententiam aliorum presertim Francisci Venture, addens quoque nunquam in civitate clariorem cancellarium fuisse quam eum qui nunc est. Et ideo salarium sibi omnino augendum esse, sicut alii monuerunt.

APPENDIX V

Cosimo de' Medici's attitude to Pius II's crusade

24 April 1459. Dispatch of Antonio Donato, the Mantuan ambassador in Florence, to Lodovico Gonzaga, the Duke of Mantua. (Archivio di Stato, Mantua, Gonzaga, 1099, fasc. 69, fol. 428r) I am indebted to Dr R. Hatfield for pointing out this letter to me.

La Santita de nostro Signore alloggia questa sera a San Cassano; da matina venirà a disnare a la Certosa qua presso la terra a doa miglia, e sul basso farà l'intrata. Hozi son stato a visitare Cosmo, et da sua Magnificientia ho havuto che novamente è sta molto pregato da una persona che'l voglia confortare la Santita de nostro Signore a non passar più oltra. Et dice havergli risposto che esso la facesse, che ha mazor dignitade de lui. E benchè'l non me habi detto el nome, comprendo che è stato lo amico, el quale disse haverlo facto, e non essergli manchato in niente, come è vero, ma che'l ritrovava questa materia in nela mente del papa haver tanto cuppo che'l non sapeva a trovargli fondo. Domenica el goinse qua, e questa nocte ha havuto pur dele doglie ali pedi in modo che, addesso che son stato a visitarlo, me ha dato audientia sul lecto. Vor' volentieri che'l rimanesse, perchè ha una passione teribile in questa facenda. E se le persuasione e sforti suoi non hanno possuto valere in revocare la venuta, è dubbio che non vaglieno in far acelerare la partit~~ta~~a. Cosimo me dice ancora che altri gli hanno ditto che, se'l voleva operarsi, el faria restare el papa qua, e non passaria più oltra; et che ha risposto non volerlo fare, perchè Nostro Signore ha tuolto questa impresa per ben di tuta la Cristianitade, e gran lezereza seria la sua a tentare che'l non andasse, et pareria che'l si fusse mosso per cupiditade del denaro, et utile de questo, più tosto che per altra casone, et non voleva per alcun modo impazarsene. Me dice ancora la Magnificientia sua che'l papa gli ha mandato a domandare il parere suo in questa facenda. E benchè'l conosca che la mossa sua sia stata cum po' chossiglio, et che'l se gli poria oponere, tamen non ha voluto esser lui quello che biasemi cosa che la Santita sua habi facto, et che'l gli ha risposto che ad ogni modo gli pare che'l deba venire, poichè ha scripto e chiamato tuti li signori a la dieta; et che quando el non venesse, quelli signori che nonn erano se excusariano et direbeno che sapevano bene che lui non veneva, e però non son venuti loro; e per tuto il mondo gli seria gran vituperio e vergogna. La Santita sua domenica de sera disse che ad ogni modo el voleva venire, e che se'l era alcuno che facesse altro pensiero, se afatigava in vano. Non so se lo dicesse che forse gli fusse sta dato aviso delo assalto novo che havevano ordinato fargli queste cardinalli, et per avisarli che a sua posta el non mutaria proposito. Sichè non è dubio che'l vera, et di tuto m'è parso avisarne la Excellentia vostra.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript sources

Arezzo, Archivio di Stato

Catasto
Estrazioni
Provisiones

Arezzo, Biblioteca Comunale

Manoscritti

Florence, Archivio di Stato

Arte della Seta
Arte di Giudici e Notai
Arte di Medici e Speciali
Balie
Capitoli
Carte di Corredo
Carte Stroziane
Catasto
Consiglio del Cento, Registri
Consulte e Pratiche
Corporazioni Religiose Soppresse dall'Impero Francese
Decima Repubblicana
Diplomatico, Famiglia Baldovinetti
Legazioni e Commissarie, Elezioni ed istruzioni ad
oratori
Legazioni e Commissarie, Risposte verbali di oratori
Libri Fabarum
Manoscritti
Mediceo avanti del Principato
Missive, Prima Cancelleria
Monte Comune
Monte delle doti
Notarile antecosminiano
Provvisioni, Registri
Responsive, Copiari
Statuti
Tratte
Ufficiali dei pupilli avanti del Principato

Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana

Pluteus 54

Codex 6 (Accolti's De bello)

Codex 8 (Accolti's Dialogus)

Pluteus 61

Codex 10 (French translation of William of Tyre's history)

Codex 45 (Lorenzo Fiorentino's translation of William of Tyre's history)

Pluteus 90

Codex 7, superiore (Poggio's Invectiva contra fidei violatores)

Codex 13, inferiore (Federigo di Geri d'Arezzo's verse epistles)

Ashburnham, 924, formerly 855 (Accolti's Dialogus)

Florence, Biblioteca Marucelliana
Manoscritti

Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale
Carte Passerini
Fondo Magliabecchiano*

Classe VIII, Codex 1412 (Goro d'Arezzo's
treatise on orthography)
Fondo Magliabecchiano-Strozziano
Fondo Nazionale*
Codex II, II, 40 (Poem by Rosello Roselli)
Codex II, IV, 50 (Poems by Rosello Roselli)
Fondo Palatino, Serie Panciatici*
Codex 68 (Goro d'Arezzo's grammatical treatise)
Poligrafo Gargani

Florence, Biblioteca Ricardiana
Codex 1114 (poem by Rosello Roselli)
Codex 1153 (poem by Bernardo Roselli)
Codex 1154 (poems by Antonio and Giovanni Roselli)
Codex 2823 (poem by Giovanni Roselli)

Forlì, Biblioteca Comunale
Autografi Piancastelli

Genoa, Archivio Storico Comunale
Codex 172 (Accolti's De bello)

London, British Museum
Harley 1458 (Goro d'Arezzo's Commentary on Lucan)

Mantua, Archivio di Stato
Carte Gonzaga

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana
Codex C 145 (Orations by Messer Antonio Roselli)

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal
Codex 670 (Accolti's De bello)

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Vaticana
Fondo Ottoboniano Latino*
Codex 1677 (Letter of Lapo da Castiglionchio
to Flavio Biondo on historiography)
Fondo Vaticano Latino
Fondo Urbano Latino

Venice, Archivio di Stato
Senato, Deliberazioni, Secreti, Registri

Venice, Biblioteca Marciana
Codex Latinus, classe 7, n. 4 (Letter of Girolamo
Aliotti to Accolti)

N.B. Only manuscripts containing literary works have been
cited in detail. An asterisk indicates that other
manuscripts from the series have been cited in the
text in addition to the literary work mentioned below.

Published sources

ACCOLTI, BENEDETTO. De bello a christianis contra barbaros gesto libri IV, in Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux, vol. V. Paris, 1895.

——— Dialogus de praestantia virorum sui aevi, in F. Villani, Liber de civitatis Florentiae famosis civibus (ed. G. Galletti). Florence, 1847.

——— 'Le rime di Benedetto Accolti d'Arezzo, detto anche Benedetto da Pontenano, 1415-1464' (ed. E. Jacoboni). Studi di filologia italiana, XV, 1957.

ALBERT OF AIX. Historia hierosolymitana, in Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux, vol. IV. Paris, 1879.

ALBERTI, LEON BATTISTA. Opere volgari, per la più parte inedite e tratte dagli autografi (ed. A. Bonucci). 5 vols. Florence, 1843-49.

ALIOTTI, GIROLAMO. Epistolae et opuscula. 2 vols. Arezzo, 1769.

Annales Aretinorum Maiores et Minores, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XXIV, part 1 (ed. A. Bini and G. Grazzini). Città di Castello, n.d.

SANT'ANTONINO. Chronica. 3 vols. Lyons, 1586.

Appendice di documenti tratti dal R. Archivio di Stato di Firenze (ed. F. C. Pellegrini). Pisa, 1891.

BARTOLOMEO DI SER GORELLO. Cronica dei fatti d'Arezzo, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XV, part 1 (ed. A. Bini and G. Grazzini). Bologna, 1917.

BIONDO, FLAVIO. Historiarum ab inclinato Romano imperio decades III, in De Roma triumphante libri decem. . . Romae instauratae libri III. Italia illustrata. Historiarum ab inclinato Romano imperio decades III. etc. Basel, 1531.

——— Scritti inediti e rari di Biondo Flavio, in Studi e testi, vol. XLVIII (ed. B. Nogara). Rome, 1927.

BOCCACCIO, G. Amorosa visione (ed. V. Branca). Florence, 1944.

BONVICINUS DE RIPPA. 'De magnalibus urbis Mediolani' (ed. F. Novati). Bulletino dell'Istituto storico italiano, XX, 1898.

BRACCIOLINI, POGGIO. Epistolae (ed. T. Tonelli). 3 vols. Florence, 1832-61.

- _____ Opera. Basel, 1538.
- _____ Opera omnia (ed. R. Fubini). 4 vols. Turin, 1964-9.
- BRUNI, LEONARDO. Difesa di Leonardo Bruni Aretino contro i reprensori del popolo di Firenze nella impresa di Lucca (ed. P. Guerra). Nozze Guerra-Mariani. Lucca, 1864.
- _____ Epistolae (ed. L. Mehus). 2 vols. Florence, 1741
- _____ Historiarum florentini populi libri XII, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XIX, part iii (ed. E. Santini). Città di Castello, 1934.
- _____ Historiarum florentini populi libri XII (ed. G. F. Mancini). 3 vols. Florence, 1855-60.
- _____ Humanistisch-philosophische Schriften (ed. H. Baron). Leipzig, 1928.
- _____ Rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarium, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XIX, part 3 (ed. C. di Pierro). Bologna, n.d.
- BUONINSEGNI, D. Storie della città di Firenze. Florence, 1637.
- CAMBI, G. Istorie, in Delizie degli eruditi toscani (ed. Fr. Ildefonso di San Luigi). 24 vols. Florence, 1770-89.
- CAMPANO, G.A. Braccii Perusini vita et gesta, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XIX, part 4 (ed. R. Valentini). Bologna, n.d.
- CASTIGLIONCHIO, LAPO DA. Dialogus super excellentia curie Romane (ed. R. Scholz), in Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken, XVI, 1914.
- CAVALCANTI, G. Istorie fiorentine. 2 vols. Florence, 1838-9.
- _____ Le commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi (ed. C. Guasti). 3 vols. Florence, 1867-73.
- _____ Le consulte della Repubblica Fiorentina dall'anno MCCLXXX al MCCXVIII (ed. A. Gherardi). 2 vols. Florence, 1896-8.
- CRIVELLI, L. De expeditione Pii Papae II adversus Turcos, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XXIII, part V (ed. G. C. Zimolo). Bologna, n.d.
- _____ De vita et rebus gestis Sfortiae. . . historia, in Rerum italicarum scriptores. Vol. XIX. Milan, 1731.

DANTE ALIGHIERI. La divina commedia (ed. T. Casini).
Florence, 1903.

Delizie degli eruditi toscani (ed. Fr. Ildefonso di San
Luigi). 24 vols. Florence, 1770-89.

La disputa delle arti nel Quattrocento (ed. E. Garin).
Florence, 1947.

Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo nel medio evo
(ed. U. Pasqui). 3 vols. Florence, 1899-1937.

Documenti sulle relazioni delle città toscane coll'oriente
e coi Turchi (ed. G. Müller). Florence, 1879.

Due legazioni al sommo pontifice per il comune di Firenze
presedute da Sant'Antonino Arcivescovo (ed. C. Guasti).
Florence, 1857.

Fasti consolari dell'Accademia fiorentina (ed. S. Salvini).
Florence, 1717.

FAZIO, B. De viris illustribus (ed. L. Mehus). Florence,
1745.

FICINO, M. Opera omnia. Turin, 1962.

GERVASE OF CANTERBURY. The Historical Works of Gervase of
Canterbury (ed. W. Stubbs). 2 vols. London, 1879.

GUIBERTUS DE NOVIGENTO. Gesta dei per Francos, in Recueil
des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux.
Vol. IV. Paris, 1879.

Il 'Liber secretus iuris Caesaris' dell'Università di Bo-
logna (ed. A. Sorbelli). 2 vols. Bologna, 1938-42.

Il libro di Montaperti (ed. C. Paoli). Florence, 1889.

LONGINUS, D. C. 'Longinus' On the Sublime (ed. D. A. Russell).
Oxford, 1964.

MAP, WALTER. De nugis curialium (ed. M. R. James). Oxford,
1914.

Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire de la croisade
au xvme siècle, 2e ser. (ed. N. Iorga). Paris, 1899.

PALMIERI, M. Della vita civile (ed. F. Battaglia). Bologna,
1944.

PETRARCA, F. Epistolae variae (ed. G. Fracassetti). Florence,
1863.

____ Le familiari (ed. V. Rossi and U. Bosco). 4 vols.
Florence, 1933-42.

____ Liber sine nomine (ed. P. Piur). Halle, 1925.

____ Opera omnia. Basel, 1581.

PIUS II. Commentaries (tr. F. A. Gragg), in Smith College Studies in History. XXII, 1936-7; XXV, 1939-40; XXX, 1947; XXXV, 1951; XLIII, 1957.

PIPINO, FRANCESCO. Liber de acquisitione Terrae Sanctae, in Rerum italicarum scriptores. Vol. VII. Milan, 1725.

Prosatori latini del Quattrocento (ed. E. Garin). Milan, n.d.

Il protocollo del carteggio della Signoria di Firenze. 1459-1468 (ed. M. del Piazzo). Rome, 1969.

Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pädagogik des Humanismus (ed. C. Müllner). Vienna, 1899.

ROBERT OF ST REMY. Historia iherosolimitana, in Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux, vol. III. Paris, 1866.

RUCELLAI, G. Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo Zibaldone. I: 'Il Zibaldone Quaresimale' (ed. A. Perosa). London, 1960.

SALUTATI, L. C. P. De nobilitate legum et medicinae. De verecundia (ed. E. Garin). Florence, 1947.

— De seculo et religione (ed. B. L. Ullman). Florence, 1957.

— Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati (ed. F. Novati). 4 vols. Rome, 1891-1911

— Invectiva contra Antonium Luschum (ed. D. Moreni). Florence, 1826.

SANUDO, M. Liber secretorum fidelium crucis, in Gesta Dei per Francos, sive Orientalium expeditionum historia (ed. J. Bongars). Hanoviae, 1611.

Scritti letterari (ed. A. Lumini). Ser. 1^a. Arezzo, 1884.

Statuta populi et communis Florentie. 3 vols. Friburgi, 1778-83.

Statuti della repubblica fiorentina (ed. R. Caggese). 2 vols. Florence, 1910-21.

Statuti della Università e Studio Fiorentino (ed. A. Gherardi). Florence, 1881.

STEFANI, M. Cronaca fiorentina, in Rerum italicarum scriptores, new series, vol. XXX, part 1 (ed. N. Rodolico). Città di Castello, 1903.

TEDALDI, J. 'Informations. . . de la prinse de Constantinople par l'empereur Turk. . .', in E. Martène and U. Durand, Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, vol. I. Paris, 1717.

Testi di lingua tratti da' codici della Biblioteca Vaticana
(ed. G. Manzi). Rome, 1816.

Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste (ed. L. Pastor).
Vol. I. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1904.

VALLA, L. De falsa credita et ementita Constantini donatione
declamatio (ed. W. Schwahn). Leipzig, 1928.

VESPASIANO DA BISTICCI. Le vite (ed. A. Greco). Vol. I.
Florence, 1970.

—— Vite di uomini illustri (ed. L. Frati). 3 vols.
Bologna, 1892-3.

—— Commentario della vita di G. Manetti, in Collezione
di opere inedite o rare (ed. P. Fanfani), vol. II.
Bologna, 1862.

VILLANI, F. De origine civitatis Florentiae, in id. Liber
de civitatis Florentiae famosis civibus (ed. G. C.
Galletti). Florence, 1847.

VILLANI, G. Cronica (ed. F. G. Dragomanni). 4 vols.
Florence, 1844-5.

WILLIAM OF MALMSBURY. De gestis Regum Anglorum, libri quin-
que; Historiae novellae libri tres (ed. W. Stubbs).
2 vols. London, 1887-9.

WILLIAM OF TYRE. Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis
gestarum (L'estoire de Eracles Empereur et la conquete
de la terre d'outremer), in Recueil des historiens
des croisades. Historiens occidentaux, vol. I.
Paris, 1841

—— History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea (ed. and tr.
E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey). 2 vols. New York,
1943.

Secondary works

- ADY, C. Pius II. Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini. The Humanist Pope. London, 1913.
- BABINGER, F. 'Lorenzo de' Medici e la Corte ottomana'. Archivio storico italiano, CXXI, 1963.
- 'Maometto II, il conquistore, e l'Italia'. Rivista storica italiana, LXIII, 1951.
- BALDWIN, C. S. Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic to 1400. Interpreted from Representative Works. New York, 1928.
- BARBADORO, B. 'Gli umanisti aretini'. Annali della cattedra petrarchesca, VIII, 1938.
- BARON, H. The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance. Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny. 1st ed. 2 vols. Princeton, 1955.
- The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance. Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny. Revised, one-volume edition. Princeton, 1966.
- 'Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought'. Speculum, XIII, 1938.
- From Petrarch to Bruni. Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature. Chicago, 1968.
- 'The Querelle of the Ancients and the Moderns as a Problem for Renaissance Scholarship'. Journal of the History of Ideas, XX, 1959.
- BAXANDALL, M. Giotto and the Orators. Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350-1450. Oxford, 1971.
- BAYLEY, C. C. War and Society in Renaissance Florence. Toronto, 1961.
- BELOCH, C. J. Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens. 3 vols. Berlin and Leipzig, 1937-61.
- BENI, C. Guida illustrata del Casentino. Florence, 1889.
- BESTA, E. Fonti. Legislazione e scienza giuridica dalla caduta dell'impero romano al secolo decimo quinto (decimo sesto), part 2 (Storia del diritto italiano, vol. I). Milan, 1923.
- BOREL D'HAUTERIVE, A. F. J. Le monarque de la sagesse. Son tombeau et sa famille. Paris, 1869.

- BROWN, A. M. 'The Humanist Portrait of Cosimo de' Medici, Pater Patriae'. Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXIV, 1961.
- BRUCKER, G. 'Florence and its University, 1348 - 1434', in Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe. Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison (ed. T. K. Rabb and J. E. Seigel). Princeton, 1969.
- _____. Florentine Politics and Society. 1343-1378. Princeton, 1962.
- _____. 'The Medici in the fourteenth century'. Speculum, XXXII, 1957.
- _____. Renaissance Florence. New York, 1969.
- BUCHHOLZ, P. Die Quellen der Historiarum Decades Flavius Biondus. Naumberg, 1881.
- BURGESS, T. C. 'Epideictic Literature'. Studies in Classical Philology, III, 1902.
- _____. The Cambridge Economic History of Europe. Vol. II. Cambridge, 1952.
- CANESTRINI, G. La scienza e l'arte di stato desunta dagli atti ufficiali della repubblica fiorentina e dei Medici. Florence, 1862.
- CAPLAN, H. 'The Decay of Eloquence at Rome in the First Century'. Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond. Ithaca, New York, 1944. Reprinted in H. Caplan, Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Mediaeval Rhetoric (ed. A. King and H. North). Ithaca and London, 1970.
- CAPPONI, G. Storia della Repubblica di Firenze. 2 vols. Florence, 1930.
- CASINI, B. 'Aspetti della vita economica e sociale di Pisa dal catasto del 1428-29'. Bolettino storico pisano, XXXI, 1962-3.
- CASTRI, A. and PAOLINI, A. Arezzo. Illustrated Artistic Guide. Milan and Rome, 1959.
- CIULINI, R. 'Di una raccolta di antiche carte e vedute della città di Firenze'. L'universo, V, 1924.
- CLARKE, M. L. Rhetoric at Rome. A Historical Survey. London, 1953.
- CORSO, C. 'Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo lettore di diritto nello studio di Siena'. Bullettino senese di storia patria, serie 3^a, XIV-XV, 1955-6.
- CORTI, G. 'Le ricordanze trecentesche di Francesco e di Alessio Baldovinetti'. Archivio storico italiano, CXII, 1954.

COSTA, C. D. N. 'The Dialogus', in Tacitus (ed. T. A. Dorey). London, 1969.

CURTIUS, E. R. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (tr. W. R. Trask). New York, 1953.

D'ALTON, J. F. Roman Literary Theory and Criticism. A Study in Tendencies. London, 1931.

DAVIDSOHN, R. Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz. 4 vols. Berlin, 1896.

_____. Geschichte von Florenz. 4 parts. Berlin, 1896-1927.

DAVIS, C. T. 'Il buon tempo antico', in Florentine Studies. Politics and Society in Renaissance Florence (ed. N. Rubinstein). London, 1968.

DELLA TORRE, A. Storia dell'Accademia Platonica di Firenze. Florence, 1902.

DEMPSTER, T. De etruscia regali libri septem. 2 vols. Florence, 1723.

Dizionario biografico degli Italiani. Rome, 1960 - .

EUBEL, C. Hierarchia catholica medii aevi. Monasterii, 1913.

FALCIAI, M. Storia di Arezzo dalle origini alla fine del Granducato Lorenese. Arezzo, 1928.

FIUMI, E. 'Il computo della popolazione di Volterra nel medio evo secondo il "sal delle bocche"'. Archivio storico italiano, CVII, 1949.

_____. 'La demografia fiorentina nelle pagine di Giovanni Villani'. Archivio storico italiano, CVIII, 1950.

_____. 'Fioritura e decadenza dell'economia fiorentina', Archivio storico italiano, CXV-CXVII, 1957-9.

_____. 'Stato di popolazione e distribuzione della ricchezza in Prato secondo il catasto del 1428-9'. Archivio storico italiano, CXIII, 1965.

_____. Storia economica e sociale di San Gimignano. Florence, 1961.

FLAMINI, FRANCESCO. La lirica toscana del Rinascimento anteriore ai tempi del Magnifico. Pisa, 1891.

FRANCESCHINI, G. 'Schede per una storia della cultura aretina nell'età dell'umanesimo'. Atti e memorie della Accademia Petrarca di Arezzo, new series, XXXVI, 1952-7.

FRATI, C. and L. 'Indice delle carte di Pietro Bilancioni'. Il propugnatore, new series, IV, 1891.

- FUBINI, R. 'Flavio Biondo'. Dizionario biografico degli Italiani. Vol. X. Rome, 1960-
- FUETER, E. Storia della storiografia moderna (tr. A. Spinelli). 2 vols. Naples, 1944.
- GARIN, E. 'I cancellieri umanisti della Repubblica Fiorentina da Coluccio Salutati a Bartolomeo Scala'. Rivista storica italiana, LXXI, 1959.
- 'Desideri di riforma nell'oratoria del Quattrocento', in La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano. Ricerche e documenti. Florence, 1961.
- L'umanesimo italiano. Filosofia e vita civile nel Rinascimento. Bari, 1952.
- GEBAUER, G. D. Leben und denckwürdige Thaten Herrn Richards erwählten Romischen Kayzers, Grafens von Cornwall und Poitou. Leipzig, 1744.
- GILL, J. The Council of Florence. Cambridge, 1959.
- GRAY, H. H. 'Valla's Encomium of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Humanist Conception of Christian Antiquity', in Essays in History and Literature presented to Stanley Pargellis (ed. H. Bluhm). Chicago, 1965.
- HAGEN, H. 'Eine neue Handschrift von Benedetto Accoltis Geschichte des Kreuzzuges'. Vierteljahrsschrift für Kultur und Litteratur der Renaissance, I, 1885.
- HANKEY, A. T. 'Domenico Bandino of Arezzo (?1335-1418)'. Italian Studies, XII, 1957.
- 'The library of Domenico di Bandino'. Rinascimento, VIII, 1957.
- 'The successive revisions and surviving codices of the Fons Memorabilium Universi of Domenico di Bandino'. Rinascimento, XI, 1960.
- HASKINS, C. H. Studies in Mediaeval Culture. Oxford, 1929.
- HAY, D. 'Flavio Biondo and the Middle Ages'. Proceedings of the British Academy, XLV, 1959.
- HERLIHY, D. Medieval and Renaissance Pistoia. The Social History of an Italian Town, 1200-1430. New Haven, 1967.
- KENT, C. V. Political Alignments in Florence on the Eve of Cosimo de' Medici's Rise to Power. 1427-1434. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1971.
- KRISTELLER, P. O. Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters. Rome, 1956.

- LAZZERI, C. Aspetti e figure di vita medievale in Arezzo. Arezzo, 1937.
- LEEMAN, A. D. Orationis ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1963.
- LEFF, G. Heresy in the Later Middle Ages. The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c. 1250-c. 1450. 2 vols. Manchester, 1967.
- LUISO, F. P. 'Riforma della Cancelleria Fiorentina nel 1437'. Archivio storico italiano, serie V^a, XXI, 1898.
- 'Studi su l'epistolario e le traduzioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio Juniore'. Studi italiani di filologia classica, VII, 1899.
- MARZI, DEMETRIO. La cancelleria della Repubblica Fiorentina. Rocca San Casciano, 1910.
- MCDONALD, A. H. 'The Roman Historians', in Fifty Years -- and twelve -- of Classical Scholarship (ed. M. Platnauer). Rev. ed. with appendices. Oxford, 1968.
- MALLETT, M. The Florentine Galleys in the Fifteenth Century. Oxford, 1967.
- MANNI, C. M. Osservazioni (e giunte) istoriche sopra i sigilli antichi de' secoli bassi. 30 vols. Florence, 1739-86.
- MARCEL, R. Marcel Ficin, 1433-1499. Paris, 1958.
- MARTINES, L. Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence. Princeton, 1967.
- The Social World of the Florentine Humanists. 1390-1460. London, 1963.
- MAS LATRIE, M. L. DE 'Essai de classification des continuateurs de l'Histoire des Croisades de Guillaume de Tyr'. Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartres, Ve série, I, 1860.
- MELIS, F. 'Lazzaro Bracci (La funzione di Arezzo nell'economia dei secoli xiv-xv)'. Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Petrarca di lettere, arti e scienze, new series, XXXVIII, 1965-7.
- MESSINA, M. 'Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo'. Rinascimento, I, 1950.
- 'Le rime di Francesco Accolti d'Arezzo, umanista e giureconsolto del sec. xv'. Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LXII, 1955.
- MITCHELL, R. J. The Laurels and the Tiara. Pope Pius II. 1458-1464. London, 1962.

- MOLHO, A. Florentine Public Finances in the Early Renaissance. 1400-1433. Cambridge, Mass., 1971.
- 'A Note on Jewish Moneylenders in Tuscany in the Late Trecento and Early Quattrocento', in Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron (ed. A. Molho and J. A. Tedeschi). Florence, 1971.
- MORI, A. 'Casentino'. Enciclopedia italiana. Vol. IX. Milan, 1931.
- MORICI, M. 'Il Cardinale Niccolò Forteguerri e Giovanni di Cosimo de' Medici'. Bulletino storico pistoiese, II, 1900.
- NICCOLINI DI CAMUGLIANO, G. The Chronicles of a Florentine Family. 1200-1470. London, 1933.
- NORDEN, E. Die antike Kunstprosa vom vi. Jahrhundert vor Christ bis in die Zeit der Renaissance. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1898.
- OST, F. Die altfranzösische Übersetzung der Geschichte der Kreuzzüge Wilhelms von Tyrus. Halle a. S., 1899.
- OTTOKAR, N. Il comune di Firenze alla fine del Duecento. 2nd ed. Turin, 1962.
- PAGNINI, G. F. Della decima e di varie altre gravezze imposte dal comune di Firenze. 4 vols. Lisbon and Lucca, 1765-6.
- PALADINI, V. Sallustio. Milan, 1948.
- PANCIROLI, G. De claris legum interpretibus libri quatuor. Leipzig, 1721.
- PARDI, G. 'Disegno della storia demografica di Firenze'. Archivio storico italiano, LXXIV, 1916.
- PASQUI, U. 'La biblioteca d'un notaro aretino del secolo XIV'. Archivio storico italiano, serie V^a, IV, 1889.
- 'Raccolte di codici in Arezzo'. Atti e memorie della R. Accademia Petrarca di Arezzo, VIII, 1907-8.
- and VIVIANI, U. Guida illustrata storica, artistica e commerciale di Arezzo e dintorni. Arezzo, 1925.
- PASSERINI, L. Genealogia e storia della famiglia Altoviti. Florence, 1871.
- Genealogia e storia della famiglia Niccolini. Florence, 1870.
- PASTOR, L. Storia dei papi. 20 vols. Rome, 1958-64.

- PELLEGRINI, F. C. 'Sulla Repubblica Fiorentina a tempo di Cosimo il Vecchio'. Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Filosofia e filologia, III, 1880.
- PICCOLOMINI, E. Intorno alle condizioni ed alle vicende della Libreria Medicea Privata. Ricerche. Florence, 1875.
- PICOTTI, G. B. La dieta di Mantova e la politica de' Veneziani, in Miscellanea di storia veneta della R. Deputazione di storia patria, serie III^a, vol. IV. Venice, 1912.
- PIERACCINI, G. La stirpe de' Medici di Cafaggiolo. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Florence, 1947.
- RAMBAUD, M. Cicéron et l'histoire romaine. Paris, 1953.
- REPETTI, E. Dizionario geografico-fisico-storico della Toscana. 6 vols. Florence, 1833-46.
- REYNOLDS, B. R. 'Latin Historiography: A Survey 1400-1600'. Studies in the Renaissance, II, 1955.
- REZASCO, G. Dizionario del linguaggio italiano, storico ed amministrativo. Florence, 1881.
- RIANT, P. 'Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits de l'Éracles'. Archives de l'Orient latin, I, 1881.
- RICHA, G. Notizie istoriche delle chiese fiorentine divise ne' suoi quartieri. 10 vols. Florence, 1754-62.
- RODOLICO, N. La democrazia fiorentina nel suo tramonto (1378-1382). Bologna, 1905.
- ROEDIGER, F. Catalogue des livres manuscrits et imprimés composant la bibliothèque de M. Horace de Landau. 2 vols. Florence, 1885-90.
- RUBINSTEIN, N. 'The Beginnings of Political Thought in Florence'. Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, V, 1942.
- The Government of Florence under the Medici (1434 to 1494). Oxford, 1966.
- 'Marsilius of Padua and Italian Political Thought of His Time'. Europe in the Late Middle Ages (ed. J. R. Hale, J. R. L. Highfield and B. Smalley). London, 1965.
- 'Poggio Bracciolini cancelliere e storico di Firenze'. Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Petrarca di lettere, arti, e scienze di Arezzo, new series, XXXVII, 1958-64.

- 'Political Ideas in Sienese Art: the Frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti and Taddeo di Bartolo in the Palazzo Pubblico'. Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, XXI, 1958.
- SABBADINI, R. 'Guarino Veronese'. Enciclopedia italiana, vol. VIII. Milan, 1933.
- Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV. 2 vols. Florence, 1905-14.
- SALVEMINI, G. Magnati e popolani in Firenze dal 1280 al 1295, seguito da La dignità cavallaresca nel Comune di Firenze. Turin, 1960.
- 'Gli statuti fiorentini del Capitano e del Podestà degli anni 1322-25'. Archivio storico italiano, serie V^a, XVIII, 1896.
- SANTINI, E. 'Leonardo Bruni Aretino e i suoi "Historiarum florentini populi libri XII." Contribuita allo studio della storiografia umanista'. Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Filosofia e filologia, XXII, 1910.
- SAPORI, A. Studi di storia economica. 3 vols. Florence, 1947-67.
- SCHWOEBEL, R. The Shadow of the Crescent. The Renaissance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517. Nieuwkoop, 1967.
- SEIGEL, J. Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism. The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom, Petrarch to Valla. Princeton, 1969.
- 'The Teaching of Argyropulos and the Rhetoric of the First Humanists', in Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe. Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison (ed. T. K. Rabb and J. E. Seigel). Princeton, 1969.
- SHEPHERD, G. and TONELLI, T. Vita di Poggio Bracciolini. 2 vols. Florence, 1825.
- SORBELLI, A. and SIMEONI, L. Storia della Università di Bologna. 2 vols. Bologna, 1944-7.
- Storia di Milano. 17 vols. Milan, 1953-66.
- SYME, R. Tacitus. 2 vols. Oxford, 1958.
- THORNDIKE, L. 'Medicine versus Law in Late Medieval and Medicean Florence', in Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century. Studies in the History of Medicine and Surgery, Natural and Mathematical Science, Philosophy and Politics. New York, 1929.
- UGOLINO, A. Gregorio d'Arezzo e le rime. Livorno, 1901.
- ULLMAN, B. L. 'History and Tragedy'. Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, LXXIII, 1942.

- _____. The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati. Padua, 1963.
- VARESE, P. 'Condizioni economiche e demografiche di Arezzo nel secolo xv'. Annuario del R. Istituto Magistrale di Arezzo, I, 1924-5.
- VIVIANI, U. Medici, fisici, e cerusici della Provincia Aretina vissuti dal v al xvii secolo d.C. Arezzo, 1923.
- VOIGT, G. Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini als Papst Pius II und sein Zeitalter. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Berlin, 1856-63.
- WALBANK, F. 'Tragic History -- a Reconsideration'. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London, II, 1955.
- WALSER, E. Poggius Florentinus. Leben und Werke. Leipzig and Berlin, 1914.
- WALSH, P. G. Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods. Cambridge, 1961.
- WARNER, J. N. Political Ideas in Matteo Palmieri's Della vita civile. Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of London, April, 1969.
- WEISS, R. 'The Dawn of Humanism in Italy'. Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XLII, 1969.
- _____. 'Lineamenti per una storia del primo umanesimo fiorentino'. Rivista storica italiana, LX, 1948.
- _____. Il primo secolo dell'umanesimo. Rome, 1949.
- WIERUSZOWSKI, H. 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century'. Traditio, IX, 1953.
- _____. 'Ars Dictaminis in the Time of Dante'. Medievalia et Humanistica, I, 1943.